Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-119
Wednesday
20 June 1990

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-90-119 *20 June 1990*

CONTENTS

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Military Reductions 'Lagging Behind' USSR *[TASS]* 1
Chemical Weapons Talks To Be Held in U.S. *[Moscow TV]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Western Leaders Cited on Germany, NATO *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 3
Berlin Unification Committee Meeting Reported *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 3
Easing of Cocom Restrictions Assessed *[PRAVDA 11 Jun]* 3

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

USSR-U.S. Environment Conference Opens *[TASS]* 5
U.S., USSR Should Play 'Rallying Role' *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 5

China

Rogachev Interviewed on Eve of China Visit *[Moscow International]* 7
Chinese Communist Youth League Delegation Visits 8
Meets With Stroyev *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 8
Meets Counterparts *[Moscow International]* 8

Northeast Asia

Seoul Positive on DPRK Arms Reduction Proposal *[Moscow International]* 8
ROK, Chamber of Commerce Sign Trade Accord *[Moscow International]* 9
ROK Trade Delegation Arrives in Kharabovsk *[TASS]* 9
Japan's Prime Minister Kaifu on 1991 Summit *[Moscow International]* 9
Kaifu on Global Changes, Entering 21st Century *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 10
Perestroyka, Changes Inspire Tokyo Antiwar Rally *[Moscow International]* 14
Joint Friendship Congress Meets in Tokyo *[Moscow International]* 14
Japanese Ambassador Received at Foreign Ministry *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 15
Japanese Journal on Northern Territories Founded *[Moscow International]* 15

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Readiness for Peace Talks Questioned *[Kushnir on Radio Peace and Progress]* 16
Notable Increase in Emigrants to Israel Noted *[TASS]* 16
Gorbachev Greets Reelected Israeli CP Leaders *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 17
Potential for Iran, Iraq Leaders' Meeting Viewed *[Andreyev on Moscow International]* 17
Iraq Criticizes Iranian Threat of Naval Blockade *[Radio Peace and Progress]* 17
TASS Correspondent Dies in Accident in Iraq *[TASS]* 18

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Views Summit Discussion on Africa *[Moscow International]* 18
Ethiopian Rebels Threaten Food Supply Aircraft *[IZVESTIYA 15 Jun]* 19
Internal Ugandan Situation Remains 'Difficult' *[Borisov on Moscow International]* 20

East Europe

GDR Volkskammer on German Unity, Constitution *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 20
GDR's Gysi Rejects Move Toward Center *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 21
Commander Confirms Naval Base Existence *[GAZETA WYBORCZA 13-14 Jun]* 21
Reportage on Normalizing of Bucharest Situation 21
Control Again in City *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 21
Illescu Greets Miners *[PRAVDA 17 Jun]* 22

West Europe

Nikitin Receives Austrian Vice Chancellor *[TASS]* 22
Laverov on Austrian Ties, Technology Transfer *[TASS]* 23
More on Hijacking of Helsinki-Bound Aircraft *[TASS]* 23
Hijacker Said 'Acting Alone' *[TASS]* 23
Further Reports on Shevardnadze-Genscher Meetings 24
Joint Pact-NATO Goals Proposed *[Hamburg DER SPIEGEL 18 Jun]* 24
Shevardnadze on Bilateral Ties *[Moscow Radio]* 24
All-Europe Security Discussed *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 24
Alliances Examined Further *[Moscow International]* 26
FRG Reportage on Visit *[cross-reference]* 26
Kohl Cited on NATO-Pact, Security Interests *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* 26
Antisubmarine Ships Conclude Visit to Italy *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* 27
Yavoz Meets With Netherlands' Counterpart 18 Jun *[TASS]* 27
Territorial Agreement Signed *[TASS]* 27
Spanish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives 18 Jun *[TASS]* 27
Holds Talks on European Ties *[TASS]* 27
Meets With Zagladin *[TASS]* 28
Swedish Pilots Demand Hijacker's Extradition *[TASS]* 28
Embassy in Ankara Seeks Hijacked Plane's Return *[TASS]* 28

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Resolution on Transition to Market *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 29
Supreme Soviet Session Ends in Controversy *[IZVESTIYA 16 Jun]* 30
15 Jun Presidium Meeting Viewed *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 32
Conference Airs USSR Germans' Concerns *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 32

Political & Social

Gorbachev Warns He Might Lose Position Soon *[AFP]* 33
Prison Riots Seen at Chelyabinsk, Dnepropetrovsk 33
Details Viewed *[Moscow TV]* 33
Troops Stabilize Unrest *[TASS]* 33
Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress 34
Roundtable Discusses Prospects *[PRAVDA 14 Jun]* 34
Shostakovskiy on Platform Debate *[TRUD 12 Jun]* 40
Opposition Should Drop 'Cliches' *[PRAVDA 6 Jun]* 43
Democratic Party Platform Conference Reported *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 44
Peasant Union Congress Decisions Examined *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 46
Mineworkers' Congress Results Reported *[IZVETIYA 17 Jun]* 46
Constitution Oversight Chairman Interviewed *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 47
Supreme Court Chairman on Judicial Independence *[Moscow Radio]* 49
Chernobyl Fund Suit Shows Rule-of-Law Progress *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 49
Meeting on Tyumen Oil Workers' Concerns Viewed *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 50
Meeting Discusses Auditing Commission Clause *[TASS]* 51
Deputy Health Minister Baranov Views Problems *[Moscow TV]* 51
Head of TV, Radio Discusses Greater Freedom *[Moscow Radio]* 51

Economic

Abalkin Stresses Regulated Market Economy *[Moscow International]* 52
Abalkin, Others Defend Economic Program *[EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN No 24]* 52
Gorbachev Aide on Move to Market Economy *[Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT 15 Jun]* 57
Ryzhkov Signs Temporary Rules for Shareholders *[Moscow International]* 58
USSR Law on Enterprises Published *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 12 Jun]* 58

Military

Construction Battalions 'Disgrace' of Soviet Army *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 68
Navy Considers Lifting Sunken Nuclear Submarine *[Moscow International]* 68
Military Historian Discusses New WWII History *[APN PRESS RELEASE]* 69

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Proposes Possibility of Moratorium *[TASS]* 71
Landsbergis Presents Proposal *[Vilnius International]* 71
Lukyanov Cited on Proposal *[Vilnius Radio]* 71
Minister, Deputy on Proposal *[Vilnius International]* 72
Prunskiene on Proposal *[Vilnius International]* 72
Commissions To Discuss Topic *[TASS]* 72
Baltics Send Letters to European Parliament *[Vilnius Radio]* 73
Latvian City To Ignore Ban on Lithuanian Exports *[Riga Radio]* 74
Council Declines Invite To Draft Union Agreement *[Vilnius International]* 74
Vilnius Radio Carries 19 June Supreme Council 74
Agenda Approved 74
Moratorium Proposal Read 74
Insurance Law Debated 75
Lithuanian Poles' Problems Viewed 76
Lithuanian Developments With Moscow Reviewed *[19 Jun]* 76
Issue of Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Paper Published *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 16 Jun]* 77
Estonia Decrees Permission for Private Enterprises *[Tallinn Radio]* 77
Report on Joint Council of Labor Collectives *[IZVESTIYA 12 Jun]* 77
Estonia Adopts Statement on 'Occupation' *[Tallinn Radio]* 78
USSR: Estonian Enterprises Form Association *[Tallinn TV]* 78

RSFSR

Gorbachev Remarks at 20 June Conference Reported *[Moscow Radio]* 78
Russian Communists Vote on 'Founding Congress' *[TASS]* 80
Political, Social Situation Viewed at Conference *[TASS]* 80
Russian Conference Views Workers' Voting Rights *[Moscow TV]* 80
19 June Russian Party Conference Continues *[Moscow TV]* 81
Osadchiy Reads Report 81
Democratic Platform Report Read 81
Marxist Platform Report Read 82
Tyulkin Speaks 83
Speaker Urges Unity 83
Gidaspov Speaks 84
Military Situation Viewed 85
Kemerovo Oblast Leader Speaks 86
'Text' of Gorbachev's 19 June Conference Speech *[TASS]* 86
Osadchiy Delivers Preparatory Committee Report *[Moscow TV]* 97
Lysenko, Tyulkin Address Russian Conference *[Moscow Radio]* 100
Lysenko Presents Democratic Platform Report *[Moscow TV]* 100
TASS Summarizes 19 June Russian Conference 102
Russian Communists Consider Alternative Platforms *[TASS]* 103
Central Committee Leader on Party Conference *[TASS]* 104

Agenda for Congress of People's Deputies Reported *[TASS]* 104
Silayev Calls for 'Radical Economic Reform' *[TASS]* 104
Parliament Forms Committees, Commissions *[TASS]* 104

Western Republics

First Belorussian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes *[Moscow Radio]* 105
Stock Exchange Reopens in Minsk After 60 Years *[TASS]* 105
Moldavian Law on Dignity of Supreme Soviet Chief
[SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA 7 Jun] 105
Moldavian Resolution on Mass Media Viewed *[PRAVDA 19 Jun]* 105
Ukrainian Party Congress Opens in Kiev 19 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 106
Proceedings Viewed *[Moscow Radio]* 106
Ivashko Delivers Activities Report *[TASS]* 106
Deputies View Sovereignty *[Kiev International]* 107
Kharkov Oblast, City Party Leaderships Combined *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 107
Ukrainian Communist Faction Group Formed *[Kiev Radio]* 107
Young Ukrainian Insulters of Lenin Pardoned *[Kiev Radio]* 107
Odessa Proclaimed Free Enterprise Territory *[TASS]* 107
Pestryalovo Radar Construction Arouses Protest *[Kiev International]* 108
Rally Protests Construction of Khmelnitskiy AES *[Moscow Radio]* 108
Increasing Ferment in Western Ukraine Viewed *[GAZETA WYBORCZA 28 May]* 108
NVKD Kharkov Massacres Examined *[MOSCOW NEWS No 1]* 109

Caucasus

Armenian Party Elects CPSU Congress Delegates *[Yerevan Radio]* 111
Armenian Army Officer Denounces Armed Groups *[Yerevan Radio]* 111
Army Paper Reviews Armenian Anti-Army Events *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 30 Oct]* 111
Artashatskiy Rayon Elects New First Secretary *[Yerevan Radio]* 112
Armenian, Azerbaijani 16 June Meeting Reported *[Yerevan Radio]* 112
More on Meeting *[Baku Radio]* 112
Situation in NKAO Seen 'Extremely Tense' *[Yerevan Radio]* 113
Azerbaijan Ministers Debate NKAO's Development *[Baku Radio]* 113
Nakhichevan's Social, Economic Development Viewed *[Baku Radio]* 113
Azerbaijan President Mutalibov on Market Economy *[TASS]* 113
Azerbaijan's Mutalibov Meets Stepanakert Officials *[Baku Radio]* 114
Azerbaijan Party, People's Front Form Council *[BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY 19 May]* 114
Azerbaijan Auditing Commission Report Approved *[Baku Radio]* 115
Georgian Supreme Soviet To Discuss Independence *[TASS]* 115

Central Asia

Workers Address Letter of 'Concern' to Gorbachev *[TASS]* 115
Situation in Osh Returning to Normal *[Moscow Radio]* 116
'Great' Damage of Kazakhstan Quake Detailed *[TASS]* 116
Campaign Against Illegal Poppy Growing Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 5 Jun]* 116
New Turkmen Video Regulation Law Published *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 117
Uzbek Supreme Soviet Begins Work 18 Jun *[Tashkent Radio]* 117
Uzbek Medical Officer on Toxic Chemicals, AIDS *[Tashkent Radio]* 117
Termez Station To Begin Television Programming *[Moscow Radio]* 118
Voluntary Work Raises Funds for Issyk-kul Lake *[Moscow TV]* 118

U.S. Military Reductions 'Lagging Behind' USSR

LD1906215590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1418 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS military observer Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)—The Soviet Union's proposal to start talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe in autumn this year, irrespective of the time it takes to sign an agreement on conventional weapons, has been rejected by NATO. The representative of the North Atlantic bloc stated in Brussels that such talks can only be started after an accord has been reached in Vienna.

One cannot say that over the last few years the position of the United States and NATO regarding tactical nuclear weapons has not undergone changes. Individual shifts in the United States' attitude to nuclear weapons with a range of up to 500 km have taken place. There was a time when Washington rejected Soviet proposals regarding talks on these weapons in general. Later, President George Bush stated the United States' willingness to start such talks, but only after an agreement on conventional weapons in Europe had been signed. It was announced that Washington had rejected plans to modernize the land-based "Lance" tactical missiles and the nuclear artillery. These positive changes, however, were accompanied by the adoption of NATO plans for deploying new air-based nuclear missiles which should bring about nothing in terms of the significance of the talks on ground-based missile systems and the decision on rejecting plans for the modernization of the "Lance" missiles and the United State's nuclear artillery in Europe. The official U.S. representatives, moreover, are constantly stressing that the talks on short-range nuclear weapons should not pursue the aim of eliminating them completely.

On the other hand, last year the Soviet Union withdrew 500 nuclear warheads from the territory of its allies in Europe, and then took the decision to reduce its forces in the GDR, the CSFR, Hungary, and Poland by 60 tactical missile launching installations. In central Europe there is to be a reduction of 250 units of Soviet nuclear artillery. Throughout the area of the European USSR, tactical missile launching installations are to be cut by 140, and artillery nuclear warheads by 3,200 by the end of the current year.

A comparison of the practical actions of the USSR and the United States in the sphere of tactical nuclear weapons forces one to establish a regularity—the changes in the positions of the United States with respect to tactical nuclear weapons are considerably lagging behind the Soviet Union's initiative, both from the point of view of time and in terms of resolving the problem.

The fact is, evidently, that the Pentagon still has not rejected the conception of a "limited nuclear war" in Europe, at a great distance from U.S. territory. Just as before, NATO regards its strategy of "flexible reaction" as being of paramount importance, which envisages in the event of an armed conflict a gradual stepping up of the employment of weapons ranging from nuclear artillery to "Trident-2" missiles on submarines in European waters. The majority of unbiased experts also formerly assessed both of NATO's strategic aims as unrealistic. Under present conditions they have simply become absurd.

A session of the NATO Council, at the level of heads of states and governments, is to convene in London in July, and should also discuss in particular the problems of bringing the alliance's military strategy in line with the new situation in Europe. NATO's official rejection of the conception of a "limited nuclear war," and of the "flexible reaction" strategy, would not only lead to a further lessening of tension in Europe, but would also facilitate a solution to the problem of tactical nuclear weapons.

Chemical Weapons Talks To Be Held in U.S.

LD1906222990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1700 GMT on 19 June, in its "Vremya" newscast, broadcasts a video repot by correspondent M. Osokin, identified by caption, on a Soviet delegation which is to hold chemical weapons reduction talks in the United States. The announcer introduces the program, saying that according to reports from the United States, a Soviet delegation will hold talks there on Wednesday and Thursday with representatives of the United States chemical troops, and on the agenda is the discussion of projects that it would have been hard to imagine yesterday.

The video report by Osokin then begins with shots of the U.S. Army Tooele Army Depot and his description of the establishment as a "chemical storage facility" in Utah that has been visited by Soviet delegations.

Osokin goes on to say that the subject of the talks will be ways of dismantling "shells like these," while the video shows rows of canister-like objects. "According to an agreement signed in Washington, each of the sides undertook to destroy by the year 2000 all stocks apart from 5,000 tons and, for the first time, it is a matter of pooling efforts," he says. This commentary is accompanied by video flashbacks to the last Soviet-U.S. summit. The point is reinforced by a brief excerpt from Gorbachev's report on the summit to the USSR Supreme Soviet, in which Gorbachev says: "There was an exchange of views with the President on that subject, with a view to exchanging technology for destroying chemical weapons."

Osokin goes on to detail one of the "most amazing projects," quoting a WASHINGTON POST report that Soviet experts had proposed sending Soviet shells to a U.S. factory "so as to work out joint dismantling methods." "But how are the plans to be implemented?" Osokin continues, over video of a summit news conference, followed by pictures of a weapons-dismantling

operation by U.S. troops. "Such scenes of shell destruction were to have become a reality at the Soviet factory in Chapayevsk, but it was closed in September under pressure from environmentalists," Osokin says. The U.S. was having similar problems, Osokin continues: the construction of three such establishments had been delayed for environmental reasons. The video at this point shows a U.S. Army tank decontamination operation, followed by troops donning chemical warfare protection suits.

Osokin goes on: "It is ironic that, for many years, chemical weapons were seen as an important and inexpensive deterrent but no one wondered what their elimination might cost." This experience, Osokin continues over video shots of scenes of Congress, led the U.S. Congress to take a close look at all Pentagon requests for money to build "cheap weapons." "Similar conclusions are also being drawn in our parliament, it seems," Osokin adds. "It is being said that, in general, the scale of the reduction poses the question of why so many weapons were created and that tight monitoring of all military programs will be needed in the future."

Over video of scenes from the USSR Supreme Soviet, Osokin comments: "The trouble over chemical weapons can serve as a lesson on how the two powers, having made so many weapons, now find themselves in a tricky situation when it is a matter of eliminating them. Incidentally, this does not apply to chemical shells only." This remark is explained in the following brief sequence, in which Gorbachev is again seen addressing the USSR Supreme Soviet, saying: "Making tanks. How many of them have we made and are now wondering what to do with?" The report ends at this point.

Western Leaders Cited on Germany, NATO

PM1906131790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "First Reaction of the West"]

[Text] M.S. Gorbachev's speech in the USSR Supreme Soviet has provoked a wide reaction abroad.

U.S. President G. Bush stated in particular at a meeting with journalists in the White House: "The question of a unified Germany's simultaneous membership of NATO and the Warsaw Pact has been discussed here in Washington. Of course it has been discussed with the leaders of East Europe, and our position is well known to President Gorbachev. It consists in the fact that a unified Germany must unconditionally be in NATO. The more we hold talks about this, the more I am convinced they will see that our proposal is the most stabilizing and responds best of all to the interests of the Soviet Union and also those of West Europe and East Europe. Therefore we will continue our efforts. But we will hear these ideas out, and discuss them without animosity."

According to a report by the DPA agency, FRG Chancellor Kohl has rejected M.S. Gorbachev's proposal that a unified Germany would become an associate member of NATO and the Warsaw Pact. "This proposal is not realistic and is therefore unacceptable. It completely ignores the rationale and basis of the Western alliance," Kohl stated. According to Kohl, NATO and the Warsaw Pact have a different character. "NATO is not a military alliance but an association of free-world states. This cannot be said of the Warsaw Pact."

The television station ZDF reported that Dregger, chairman of the CDU/CSU [Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union] in the Bundestag, commenting on M.S. Gorbachev's statement on the German question, said that it represents a "hopeful development," since the Soviet Union no longer excludes a united Germany's membership of NATO. "All the conditions listed by the USSR president can be discussed in the framework of the 'two-plus-four talks,'" Dregger stressed. "Objectively German membership of NATO responds to Soviet interests as well."

In a statement to parliament about the results of her visit to the Soviet Union, British Prime Minister M. Thatcher reported: "Britain continues to support the policies of economic reform and greater democracy in the Soviet Union. I believe that these are the most tremendous events which have taken place since World War II.

"A large part of the talks with Mikhail Gorbachev was devoted to questions of security in Europe after the unification of Germany. We are entering on a new period in East-West relations. President Gorbachev and I agreed that the presence of American troops in Europe is a stabilizing factor and they should stay there. I explained our view that a united Germany should be a member of NATO."

Later, answering questions from legislators, the prime minister rejected M.S. Gorbachev's proposal for simultaneous membership in NATO and the Warsaw Pact by a unified Germany. "I am extremely doubtful that one country can be a member of two different alliances," Thatcher stated.

Berlin Unification Committee Meeting Reported

PM1906120590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Ye. Korolev: "Talks Not Successful"]

[Text] Berlin—The first joint session of the committees of the West Berlin chamber of deputies and the city assembly of the GDR capital created to prepare for Berlin's unification has been held in West Berlin.

Those taking part were to discuss the legal aspects of the city's merger. But no constructive talk took place. Many delegates from the West Berlin CDU [Christian Democratic Union] were at odds with the principles of democracy for which they usually militate more than others.

It began with Uve Leman-Brauns a representative of the West Berlin CDU, calling the presence at the session of deputies from the PDS [Party of Democratic Socialism] "provocation." To this attack Volfiam Adolfi [name as transliterated], a member of the East Berlin assembly of deputies from the PDS, reminded his CDU counterpart that, as a result of free elections in the GDR capital, the PDS had become the second party in terms of the number of votes won and therefore was occupying a seat on the East Berlin committee "for the unification of Berlin" on absolutely legal grounds. The speech by the PDS member was frequently interrupted by sharp rejoinders from the West Berlin CDU members.

But the Christian Democrats did not forget the basic principles of democracy only with regard to the PDS. Berbel Boley [name as transliterated], representative of the GDR's "Union-90," "Green," and Independent Women's Union faction, was obliged to break off her speech. She was interrupted by CDU members at almost every phrase. The picture was so unseemly that Klaus Landowsky, general secretary of the West Berlin CDU, was obliged to apologize to Boley for the behavior of the members of his party.

As a result of this session only a "compromise" solution was reached to continue discussion of the same question at subsequent sessions of the committees which will be held once every two weeks.

Easing of Cocom Restrictions Assessed

90UF0227A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jun 90 Second Edition p 7

[Article by PRAVDA staff correspondent V. Bolshakov: "The Lists Have Been Cut Back"]

[Text] *A regular session of the Coordinating Committee for the Control of Exports to the Socialist Countries (Cocom) was held in Paris for two days, 7 and 8 June. At present 17 countries belong to this control organ created at the height of the "cold war" in 1949 on the insistence of Washington, including 15 NATO members (with the exception of Iceland), Japan, and Australia.*

The criticism of bans on exports to the socialist countries by Washington's partners has increased recently as democratic changes in the countries of East Europe and, primarily, in the USSR have developed. At the February (1990) Cocom session the United States was rebuked for still thinking in terms of the "cold war." In April of this year FRG Foreign Minister H.-D. Genscher stated that "the wall of Cocom must be destroyed."

American representatives in the organization admitted in their reports to Washington from Paris: "Actually, the United States is facing isolation in Cocom." American supporters of the previous strict "taboos" on exports to the countries of East Europe have also come under fire from their own businessmen, whom Cocom's proscription lists bind hand and foot, actually ruling out possible sizable transactions in the East. The size of the potential market found there may be judged by, say, this admission of the Paris magazine EXPRESS: "When the Cocom bans are removed, the 'informatization' alone" of the countries of East Europe (at issue is the extensive implementation of computers, household, and office data-processing equipment) will make it possible "to create a market with a volume of sales going into hundreds of billions of dollars for the next 10 years."

Under the circumstances Washington was compelled to consent to the revision of many previous restrictions. As early as April the U.S. State Department took 30 out of the 120 proscribed categories of merchandise off the Cocom lists.

The last COCOM session was held immediately after the Soviet-American summit; it was not by chance that it was expected to make radical decisions and it was proclaimed in advance that the session would be "historic." The lists of three categories of goods were supposed to be revised—telecommunication systems, machine tools, and computers. They account for approximately one-half of Cocom bans.

As always, the session was held behind closed doors. This is why we cannot make any judgment about the passions which raged there. However, it is known that the decisions made at the session are, after all, a compromise. A. Wendt, special representative of the department of strategic technology policy of the U.S. State Department, stated that at the session "measures were approved which will make it possible for the East European countries to embark on modernizing their economies." He added that this is a "radical measure." U.S. Assistant Secretary of Commerce D. Closkey explained that the Cocom lists had been reduced by approximately one-half, and this would make it possible to release for export American goods worth $45 billion. According to him the Cocom lists in their entirety will be revised in the future.

At the same time, it became known that U.S. representatives succeeded in getting a decision on building "higher fences around some goods" adopted at the session. At issue in essence is the introduction of new bans and coordination of the actions of Cocom members aimed at carrying them out. Some commentators voiced the following view: the United States resolved to acknowledge the obvious and abandoned the bans that are no longer effective by allowing the sale of obsolete technology, but ensured new bans on the export of new technology. Of course it is difficult to determine at this point the degree to which such assertions are correct. However, an analysis of specific Cocom decisions indicates that, despite "the fly in the ointment" prepared in Washington, the June Cocom session indeed became historic as had been expected—if for no other reason than that for the first time Western supporters of developing businesslike relations and fruitful cooperation with East Europe managed to accomplish a decisive turnaround from thinking in the spirit of the "cold war" to a new way of thinking. After all, reducing the Cocom list by 50 percent is a truly revolutionary endeavor, taking into account the history of the NATO "committee on bans."

United States & Canada

USSR-U.S. Environment Conference Opens

LD1906101990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0030 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Summary] Washington, 19 Jun (TASS)—A Soviet-U.S. conference on environmental protection in the 1990's opened in Lexington on Monday. A. Yablokov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Issues of Ecology and the Rational Utilization of Natural Resources, noted the importance of the topics to be discussed there.

U.S., USSR Should Play 'Rallying Role'

PM1906133990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Interview with Academician V. Goldanskiy by A. Ivanko: "Could the USSR and the United States Become Allies?"]

[Text] The well-known U.S. political scientist and journalist William Safire once remarked that the leading doctrines in the sphere of international politics get their names after they have started to operate. First you have some kind of result, then the term appears. The notorious "Brezhnev doctrine" got its name after Soviet troops were sent into Czechoslovakia in 1968. This "doctrine" was based on the primacy of a misconceived socialist "fraternity," which transcended such concepts as sovereignty and the peoples' right to their own path of development. Fortunately, the "Brezhnev doctrine" is a thing of the past. Its place has been taken by the "Gorbachev doctrine"—new political thinking, whereby common human values take priority over class values. And although for some reason we do not employ the actual term "Gorbachev doctrine," it can be used to succinctly describe the Soviet government's actions in the world arena.

However, any global policy must be defined in its specific aspects. The "Gorbachev doctrine" incorporates diverse areas of foreign policy, with USSR policy vis-a-vis the United States occupying one of the leading positions. Soviet-American dialogue is in many respects the determining factor in world life today. On the basis of this premise, one can talk about the priority of the values of Soviet-American relations. USSR People's Deputy, Academician Vitaliy Iosifovich Goldanskiy advanced this thesis at a recent meeting between delegations from the U.S. National Academy of Sciences and USSR Academy of Sciences on problems of international security and arms control. Telling the story is a thankless task, so I will hand over to Vitaliy Iosifovich himself:

"Of course, we are not in the postwar period now. The voices of many European and Asian powers are becoming increasingly audible in the world arena. And on a whole range of questions their opinions are regarded as being of the same caliber as the viewpoints of the United States and the USSR. However, if one wants to make surer progress in international politics, and I am talking about today and the more distant future, in my view (and I must point out that I am expressing my own personnal opinion here) it makes sense to follow the premise that USSR-U.S. relations are of special value. Please don't get me wrong—I am not saying that Soviet and U.S. ties with other countries and with their allies are of secondary importance. There are many more elements in the world that unite than divide. But, on the basis of experience, economic and military potential, and the history of our confrontation I would nevertheless view the development of Soviet-American ties as paramount among our other foreign policy goals. Incidentally, at the press conference following the summit between the USSR and U.S. presidents M.S. Gorbachev said: 'What we are doing here is bound to be useful not only for the peoples of our two countries, but for the whole world...' So the USSR and the United States can assume the role of helmsmen in the rough sea of world politics. I think everyone will benefit from this.

"The principle met with approval in America, although doubts were expressed about the possibility of adopting a corresponding bilateral declaration in the very near future. Too little time has passed since we regarded one another as enemies, so it is not that easy to get back to a feeling of proximity of interests. But it must be done."

[Ivanko] What has made you think along these lines?

[Goldanskiy] Like the ripples that form in water when a rock is thrown in, perestroyka has brought about cardinal changes throughout the world, but above all in neighboring countries—in the countries of East Europe. The apparent disintegration of inviolable "fraternal" regimes and the prospect of certain countries' leaving the Warsaw Pact in the future are creating an absolutely new situation on the continent. At the same time, the idea of a common European home—and it naturally incorporates questions of safeguarding security, providing guarantees against all manner of contingencies, and ensuring economic and political prosperity—has begun to gather momentum. In the future I foresee the transformation of the two military blocs into one political bloc, let us call it ESTO (from the English abbreviation for European security treaty). Confrontation between military organizations will be replaced by a single political bloc, and the main element will be a doctrine that gives priority to the values of Soviet-American relations against the background of growing UN influence. I see this doctrine as the best guarantee of security for the common European home.

The USSR and the United States are the only countries that possess the potential to destroy one another and the whole of mankind many times over. We have at last realized this and have started the disarmament process. The signing of a treaty on a 50-percent reduction of strategic offensive weapons is within sight, I hope. Scientists are also working on scenarios for a 90-95-percent reduction, where the residue of Soviet and U.S. nuclear

weapons would be commensurate with other countries' nuclear arsenals—which would involve them in the general disarmament process as well. Our countries bear a very heavy burden of military expenditure, and the United States faces the threat of being left behind in the economic race by the new giants—a united Europe (with its center in the new Germany) and the Asia-Pacific region (centered on Japan and possibly being joined by China in the future). The appearance of such powerful forces could be a stabilizing or destabilizing factor. If one acts on the basis of the proposed doctrine, the likelihood of stabilization increases. However, in an age when it is impossible to rule out a surreptitious increase in the number of members of the nuclear club, it is not worth proceeding to a 100-percent reduction of nuclear arsenals. One could confine onself to corresponding nuclear police forces under UN auspices.

Before ESTO can be formed, a very important question has to be dealt with—economic support for perestroyka. An economically prosperous Soviet Union is a very important condition of world stability; on the other hand, an impoverished Union and resultant interethnic struggle and anarchy are a very dangerous instability factor. In my view, all-round support for Gorbachev is a matter of worldwide significance. And it is in the light of the primacy of the values of our relations that the United States must approach the complex domestic political processes in the USSR. The pragmatic approach must prevail over emotions. Moreover, the United States should not forget that in present-day conditions—in contrast to pre-perestroyka conditions—the Soviet leader has to contend with public opinion.

This applies, in particular, to the Baltic republics. I will use terminology drawn from my scientific specialty—chemistry. All chemical systems can be described on the basis of thermodynamics and kinetics. Thermodynamics is the science of equilibrium, of the final state a system arrives at as a result of the changes taking place in it. Kinetics is the science of the speed of these changes. Therefore, a thermodynamic or kinetic approach to the system is possible. Moreover, in chemistry there are smooth reactions and explosive, adiabatic systems (isolated from the outside world). For instance, the Baltic situation is a typical non-adiabatic system. The processes occurring there affect the Soviet Union, Europe, and the whole world. While sympathizing in every way with these republics' desire for sovereignty and recognizing that the actions of 1940 were coercive, I would suggest a kinetic approach, of achieving the requisite speed of action to ensure that the process does not become explosive. In the Baltic republics they reckon that there can be no question of a divorce if there was no marriage in the first place. I agree, but in a 50-year illegal marriage there can be children and grandchildren. By weakening Gorbachev's positions, the Baltic politicians are encouraging the activities of irresponsible, imperial forces—which is fatal for the Baltic republics themselves.

[Ivanko] In your view, what must be done to make your approach to Soviet-American relations a reality?

[Goldanskiy] You will not switch from confrontation to cooperation at the wave of a wand. But the path of transition has already been marked out: it was discussed at the Washington summit, which the participants and journalists rightly called an "event of immense significance." The main thing is very strict control. Not only reciprocal monitoring by the USSR and the United States, but a kind of worldwide fire observation tower from which one would be able to see whether a fire was about to break out in some place or other. Our countries possess the maximum potential for this, and we could be the nucleus of future international observation and detection systems. Mutual monitoring increases mutual trust and, in turn, increased trust facilitates monitoring. We have even begun to reevaluate our terminology. The notorious "spy satellite" is such an essential means of verification, a factor of stability. Within the framework of this verification system one could also establish a broad demilitarized zone stretching across the whole of Central Europe.

The proposed doctrine is also extremely useful when tackling regional conflicts: After all, many of them were the product of the old doctrine—if it does not benefit the United States it will benefit the USSR, and vice versa. Seats of tension have flared up periodically, but we and the Americans have only poured oil on the flames by supporting opposing sides. But if we accept that all conflicts can damage our relations we will be much more active in extinguishing conflagrations. There are positive examples of this now—joint actions to get hostages released, mutual understanding in Angola and Nicaragua.

[Ivanko] Vitaliy Iosifovich, your doctrine assumes a strong Soviet Union, but it is no secret that our country is ravaged by all manner of contradictions—from economic to interethnic. Some politicians in the West, and indeed in the USSR are even talking about the disintegration of the Union. Do you not think that in this situation your doctrine could be less viable, particularly from the U.S. viewpoint?

[Goldanskiy] Let us even consider the extreme case of Russia by itself. In terms of its own potential, size, and resources, in terms of the people's talent and industry and their contribution to world culture it is a country, if it stands on its own two feet, is politically and economically stable, it remains a great power. As I see it, the question you are posing is as follows: Is this doctrine attractive to both sides? It is obvious that it is more attractive to us at the moment than to the Americans. How advisable is it for the United States to pay so much attention to relations with a country that is on the brink of collapse? Another question arises: Is it necessary, then, to support perestroyka? In my view, Gorbachev's perestroyka and stabilization within the country are equivalent to stabilization worldwide, whereas the path to anarchy results in danger for the whole planet. It seems obvious to me that the United States and the West have a vital stake in the success of perestroyka.

[Ivanko] You mentioned economic support for perestroyka. What do you mean by this—further injections of finance into our economy?

[Goldanskiy] Various proposals have been made—there is talk of a new "Marshall Plan" for the USSR and East Europe and of lend-lease deliveries, as in World War II. These are extreme measures and it is by no means clear whether they would in themselves help. In the end, we must put our own house in order. In my view, the United States must first eliminate the discriminatory acts that are impeding the development of trade with the USSR.

[Ivanko] Do you not think your idea might encounter significant resistance on the part of conservative forces in the USSR?

[Goldanskiy] I cannot conceive of any doctrine that would be approved of by 100 percent of the people questioned in a poll. At the same time, this doctrine is based on real trends in the development of the modern world and the alternative is to continue arming oneself to the teeth and regarding America as a potential enemy. In this case we are talking about a totally different doctrine of which the enemy image is an essential component. We have been living with it for the past 72 years, looking for external and internal enemies everywhere... If one rejects the priority of commmon human values over class values, then one will also reject the doctrine I propose. So I think I will have opponents...

In conclusion, I want to stress again: Mankind is faced with the kind of problems—global problems—which would defeat not only our countries, but associations of countries and military-political blocs as well. The world community must link arms and, by activating the strength and authority of the United Nations, it may be able to find ways of solving the world's problems. But the USSR and the United States could assume a rallying, organizing role—that is how I see them acting in the foreign policy arena. Having cited M.S. Gorbachev, I will take the liberty of citing President G. Bush, who said at the joint press conference with the USSR president: "We have now reached the stage in American-Soviet relations and, indeed, in world history, where we cannot miss any opportunity of finishing off the exceptional tasks that face us." The proposed doctrine is one that widens the range of these opportunities...

China

Rogachev Interviewed on Eve of China Visit

LD1906155590 Moscow World Service in English 0610 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Last week Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev completed his visit to Beijing. He was meeting the Chinese Foreign Minister Qian Qichen and his deputy Tian Zengpei to share views on bilateral issues, the international situation, Cambodia and other problems of mutual interest. On the eve of his departure for Moscow Igor Rogachev granted an exclusive interview to our Beijing correspondent Albert Papayan, and here is what he said:

On his present trip to Beijing he fulfilled an assignment of the Soviet leadership to inform the Chinese comrades on the outcome of Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to the United States and agreements reached in Washington. The Chinese, Mr. Rogachev said, give a high assessment to the Soviet-American summit and the understanding reached on a reduction of strategic offensive arms. Beijing hopes that an agreement to halve the Soviet and American strategic arsenals will be signed by the end of the year. The Soviet deputy foreign minister said further that in his account of the Washington summit he stressed the fact that the two sides had all along tried not to prejudice the interests of third countries. A better Soviet-American relationship and cooperation would in the long run meet the interests of the third countries.

Clearly, bilateral issues also came up in Beijing. Soviet-Sino relations are on the rise following Mr. Gorbachev's visit to China in May, 1989, and a visit to the USSR by the Chinese Premier Li Peng last April. At the moment a Chinese delegation is in the Soviet Union, led by Deputy chairman of the Military Council Liu Huaging and a senior staffer of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, Pavlov, is leading a Central Committee delegation now in Beijing. However, this is not the whole picture. There is a continuous exchange of dozens and sometimes hundreds of delegations. Mr. Rogachev pointed out that relations with China were a (?staple) priority for his country, not to be affected by fluctuations of the international climate. There is a general consensus on this issue in the Soviet Union, he said. Further cooperation with China was now extending to ever new areas and growing trust between the two communist parties and peoples would contribute to the progress of perestroyka in the USSR and the major reforms pursued by the Chinese people.

Turning to the common border, Rogachev said the sides agreed to intensify their border talks in the near future. They've already mapped out 90 percent of the common border, which stretches for seven-and-a-half thousand kilometers. On 26 July a Chinese expert group will come to Moscow to join their Soviet colleagues in formalizing the agreements reached. This autumn negotiations will open on reducing the two countries' arms and troops and assume confidence-building measures. They'll proceed along the lines of the agreement on armed forces reduction reached during Li Peng's stay in Moscow. The sides have much work ahead but they're off to a good start and seem to be enthusiastic about the talks. A solution of the problem would have important economic as well as military and political implications. By reducing their contingents along the common border the sides will receive a long-term economic effect worth billions of rubles.

The Soviet deputy foreign minister said the Cambodian issue was also raised in Beijing. The sides agreed it was

high time to reach a comprehensive negotiated settlement of all aspects of that old conflict. Mr. Rogachev admitted that the sides had failed to reach a general agreement in some areas but was glad that each new meeting revealed new points of contact. The main obstacles to a final settlement in and around Cambodia could be removed by the end of the year, he said.

That was a summary of an exclusive interview granted by Soviet deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev to our Beijing correspondent Albert Papayan.

Chinese Communist Youth League Delegation Visits

Meets With Stroyev

PM2006090390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the "Official" rubric: "Meeting at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] On 15 June CPSU Central Committee Secretary Ye.S. Stroyev met Song Defu, member of the CPC Central Committee and first secretary of the Chinese Communist Youth League [CYL], who is visiting the USSR as the head of a delegation.

During a friendly conversation Ye.S. Stroyev informed his guest about the progress of the preparations for the 28th CPSU Congress and dwelt on certain topical problems relating to perestroyka in our country. Song Defu spoke about the CYL's tasks at the current stage in the reforms and the broadening of foreign ties.

Yu Hongliang, PRC ambassador to the USSR, took part in the meeting.

Meets Counterparts

OW1906152790 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] On 15 June, Zyukin, first secretary [title as heard] of the Central Committee of the All-Union Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], met at the office of the All-Union Komsomol Central Committee with Song Defu, first secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Youth League [CYL] of China. The meeting began the CYL delegation's visit to the Soviet Union. It was conducted in a friendly and constructive atmosphere.

During the meeting, both sides briefed each other on the situation in their respective country and new problems cropping up in the work of their respective Communist Youth League. Both sides pointed out that the CYL and the Komsomol braced for developing relations on the basis of equality, mutual benefits, and mutual respect of each other's interests.

Song Defu presented a letter to Zyukin, inviting him to visit China at his convenience. The Soviet side expressed its thanks when accepting the invitation.

The CYL delegation's visit to the Soviet Union will end on 22 June.

Northeast Asia

Seoul Positive on DPRK Arms Reduction Proposal

SK1606034790 Moscow International Service in Korean 0900 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Commentary by station commentator (Igor Levezev) read by announcer (Kim Yong-nam)]

[Text] According to reports from Seoul, the South Korean Government has affirmatively assessed the DPRK's recent proposal to alleviate tension on the Korean peninsula. In connection with this, our station commentator (Igor Levezev) writes as follows:

This is an assessment by the participants in a meeting of the Security Affairs Committee, which includes leading officials of the Ministries of Foreign Affairs and National Defense and the National Unification Board in South Korea. I must stress the fact that officials in Seoul have clearly and constantly called for alleviating tension in Korea, holding dialogue with North Korea, facilitating exchanges between North and South Korea, and peacefully resolving disputes. As you know, the DPRK proposed a ban on all forms of joint exercises with (?foreign) forces and preparations for combats; military exercises in which military units as big as or bigger than division-level military units are mobilized; and all forms of military exercises conducted along the Military Demarcation Line. For example, the peaceful initiative by People's Korea foresees that the DMZ will turn into a peace zone and that North and South Korea will take measures to promote trust and prevent accidental disputes; will gradually and mutually reduce their forces in three to four years; and will set the number of their troops to 100,000 each. Will this be able to markedly normalize the situation on the Korean peninsula if this proposal is realized? Of course, I think it will. However, I must point out that whenever it is time to translate their words into deeds, both Pyongyang and Seoul try to find appropriate excuses to leave everything as they were.

These excuses are the concrete wall, which divides the Korean peninsula, and mountains of weapons that North and South Korea built during the past confrontational era which spans decades. For example, Seoul finds, in the North's military superiority, excuses for the presence of the U.S. forces in South Korea. In a word, North and South Korea have not been able to reach a consensus on complicated issues on alleviating military and political confrontation or to find ways toward dialogue under an atmosphere in which they suspect each other. For example, I hope the fact that the international situation in Asia and the Pacific, including the Far East, has become favorable will affirmatively affect the situation on the Korean peninsula. [Words indistinct], what representatives of North and South Korea have officially

said leads one to believe that the two sides favor political dialogue and [words indistinct]. A YONHAP report said that the South Korean Government said that it will make a reply to the DPRK's new proposal after elaborate negotiations with the highest-level leadership of the country.

ROK, Chamber of Commerce Sign Trade Accord

SK1606094490 Moscow International Service in Korean 1100 GMT 13 Jun 90

[From the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The Soviet Chamber of Commerce and the Korean Trade Promotion Corporation signed a cooperation agreement in Moscow on Tuesday. The agreement foresees exchanging delegations, holding seminars, and training Soviet technicians in the ROK. This document also calls for promoting business relations between the two countries. The volume of trade between the two countries more than doubled last year to approximately $500,000 [as heard]. On Tuesday, the ROK Government decided to form a special committee on economic cooperation with the Soviet Union.

ROK Trade Delegation Arrives in Kharabovsk

LD1306124590 Moscow TASS in English 1134 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Text] Khabarovsk June 13 TASS—A delegation of South Korean businessmen arrived in Khabarovsk today. It is led by Nam Tok-u, chairman of the South Korea Foreign Trade Association.

"President Gorbachev's recent meeting with No Tae-u will further promote our contacts, economic for the time being," Nam told TASS. "Very few people expected trade between our two countries to reach 600 million U.S. dollars last year, when our relations were set

"Now we are more optimistic and plan to reach the sum of one billion dollars. South Korean businessmen are interested in long-term projects with your country, particularly in the Far Eastern region. We are prepared to invest our capital there. But firm guarantees are needed.

This is why we are waiting for a law on the protection of foreign investments which is to be passed by the Soviet parliament. The participation of South Korea in joint ventures and free economic zones appears to be an acceptable form of partnership. We understand the Soviet Union's desire to limit the export of its raw materials. This is why joint ventures to produce competitive ready-made goods could be a solution to this problem."

The delegation plans to meet representatives of the light, fish processing and timber industries of Khabarovsk territory.

Japan's Prime Minister Kaifu on 1991 Summit

OW1906082890 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Report on an interview with Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu by unidentified IZVESTIYA Tokyo correspondent; date and place not given]

[Text] IZVESTIYA, the Soviet central paper, carried an interview with Japanese Prime Minister Kaifu by its Tokyo correspondent in its 15 June issue. The correspondent asked Prime Minister Kaifu various questions such as how will Japan meet with the needs of the times and about which issue is the Japanese Government most cautious. However, it goes without saying that a large portion of the interview centered on relations between the Soviet Union and Japan.

In replying to the question on what Japan must do in preparation for the Soviet-Japanese summit talks scheduled for 1991, Prime Minister Kaifu stated as follows:

To give the process of changes now taking place in the world the nature of [words indistinct], it will be necessary to link the waves of reforms with the Asian-Pacific region. In this connection, I feel that improvement of Japanese-Soviet relations in particular is of great significance. Achieving the tasks of bringing the deadlock in Japanese-Soviet relations to an end and of promoting full-scale normalization of our relations will lead to the peace and well-being of the peoples of our two nations.

In my opinions, it is the responsibility of both the Japanese and Soviet leadership to do their best to achieve these tasks. In this connection, Japan has done its best drastically to improve its relations with the Soviet Union. When former Foreign Minister Uno visited the Soviet Union in May of last year, the Japanese side made a proposal to the Soviet side for a balanced expansion concept. The main points of this concept indicate that, while regarding various issues as important tasks, it will be necessary to expand overall relations between our two nations, including such practical measures as strengthening trust and exchanging personnel, in a balanced way.

After making these remarks, Prime Minister Kaifu said that Japan feels that perestroyka is moving in the correct direction, and that Japan supports this direction. Then he continued to state the following: Perestroyka's orientation lies in democracy, liberalization, and the introduction of a market-oriented economy. To help improve the future economic situation in the Soviet Union, we welcomed gladly the Soviet delegations that visited Japan to learn Japan's experiences in the economic field in November last year and in April this year.

Then, Prime Minister Kaifu touched on President Gorbachev's visit to Japan. He said that Japan is making positive efforts to improve bilateral relations on the basis of the balanced expansion concept and that Japan cherishes the expectations for President Gorbachev's visit.

Then, touching on the personal message sent recently by President Gorbachev to confirm his visit in 1991, Prime Minister Kaifu remarked as follows: It is stated in the message that "I am convinced that Soviet-Japanese summit talks scheduled for 1991 will become an important event in Soviet-Japanese relations, and that the talks will bring new character to our bilateral relations." I have a high appraisal of this view as stated by President Gorbachev. During President Gorbachev's visit to Japan, I plan to have thorough talks on the measures to normalize bilateral relations and to improve drastically the relations between our two nations.

Then, in reply to a question on what the Soviet and Japanese leadership should do to improve drastically bilateral relations, Prime Minister Kaifu stated as follows:

I have stated earlier that every effort should be made. However, I did not mean that we should make such [words indistinct] efforts as to move a mountain but to take steps forward, one after another, so that we can advance toward our goals. We must have a clear view as to what future bilateral relations should be and also as to what position our bilateral relations should take in forming the global structure in the 21st century. It is of great importance for us to think over these issues so that we can turn these prospects into realities.

This is what Prime Minister Kaifu has stated.

Kaifu on Global Changes, Entering 21st Century

PM1806134190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with Japanese Prime Minister T. Kaifu by special correspondents I. Golembiovskiy and S. Agafonov under the "IZVESTIYA Interview" rubric; place, date not given: "Toshiki Kaifu's Five Principles"—first three paragraphs are editorial introduction]

[Text] Tokyo-Moscow—Slightly over a year ago, in March 1989, when IZVESTIYA published the first interview with a Japanese prime minister (Noboru Takeshita at that time) for several decades, the very fact that the item was published was sensational, and for about two weeks running the Tokyo newspapers discussed it as if it were an extraordinary occurrence with some kind of political motive. The motive, however, was not politics but the time—or, rather, the major changes in the life of the world community and in the fate of its individual "citizens" who are making modern history. What used to be amazing now strikes nobody as exceptional, and perhaps this is why two interviews with new Japanese premier Toshiki Kaifu and Soviet mass media (first with KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA and then with NOVOYE VREMYA) did not cause a fuss and were seen as perfectly natural.

This development can only be greeted with profound satisfaction, since it shows that, after the long years in the propaganda "trenches," our countries are entering a period of normal dialogue in which the opposing position is to be respected as much as one's own, and the stating of that position is just as natural as the defense of one's own views. At this stage truly political priorities dictating the need for detailed familiarity with the views held by the partner in dialogue are coming into force, since without such familiarity it would be pointless and absurd to talk about a desire for mutual understanding.

Guided by these ideas, IZVESTIYA decided to put a few questions once again to the head of the Japanese cabinet—questions prompted (we make no secret of the fact) by the political situation. Readers will probably remember how at a Washington press conference recently the USSR president cited his visit to Japan next year as an important task for Soviet foreign policy. The desire to hear and the desire to be heard came together successfully, so today we publish Prime Minister Kaifu's extensive interview with IZVESTIYA, noting with satisfaction that both sides are equally interested in it.

Question: Esteemed Mr. Kaifu, first of all allow us to congratulate you on your reelection as prime minister, and permit us to express profound gratitude for finding time in your busy schedule to meet with representatives of the Soviet mass media and for your willingness to share your thoughts on a number of topical problems with IZVESTIYA. We consider this opportunity to bring the views of the head of the Japanese cabinet to our millions of readers to be of fundamental importance for deepening mutual understanding between our countries. That is why the first question is about homing in—if we can put it that way—on June 1990, Japan, and the second Kaifu cabinet. What are the government's main priorities: What are the positive points and what, on the contrary, causes concern and alarm?

Answer: First of all, thank you for your congratulations. But let's get back to the question. The world is currently in a maelstrom of historic change centering on the East European countries and the Soviet Union. I am very glad to have an opportunity to put my views to your people, who are—figuratively speaking—at the "focus of history." If I can carry out this task with the utmost frankness I will be satisfied.

In the last decade of the 20th century and on the threshold of the next millennium, radical processes are under way in your country to restructure the entire political and economic system. This is reflected in democratization, liberalization, and the introduction of a market economy and a multiparty system. Since the start of this year you have been implementing the important but difficult tasks of carrying out political and economic reform and settling ethnic issues—which, it seems to me, your leadership is striving to resolve in a patient manner, relying on dialogue. All these problems are exceptionally complex and require boldness and courage in their approaches, and in this connection I would like to express sincere respect for the Soviet people and your leaders who have undertaken such a

colossal burden. I am convinced that history will confirm that the current course you have chosen is the right one.

The changes taking place in your country have become a kind of epicenter whose tremors have produced a wave of transformations in the East European countries. The symbol of these transformations was the felling of the Berlin Wall. The Soviet-U.S. summit at Malta in December last year marked not only a shift in East-West relations but the start of a move to a new world order based on dialogue and consensus and free of confrontation and the other concomitants of the "cold war."

Under these conditions I believe that the most urgent foreign policy task for my country is to turn these changes into a stable trend on a global scale. Japan should actively participate in international efforts to create a world order which would ensure a glittering future for mankind. To this end we need to mobilize the whole of the experience accumulated in the 45 postwar years and our economic and technological potential, and to develop a dynamic foreign policy on this basis.

After World War II we slowly but surely groped our way down the road of creating a new Japanese society that differed from the old and whose main priorities were the ideals of freedom, democracy, and the market economy. In order to resurrect our country from the postwar ruins we rejected war as a means of resolving international conflict and built a democratic state in which all people have the opportunity to freely display their initiative, abilities, and talents, relying on a peaceful constitution that safeguards basic human rights. On this foundation our country's economy was able to develop at an unprecedented rate and to achieve its current level of development and social prosperity. Noting all this, however, we cannot forget that these achievements were also brought about by many countries' efforts to maintain world peace, and by the existence of an international economic system that safeguards the free exchange of information, technology, and material and human resources.

Looking at our country's experience and on the basis of its history, I would put forward five main positions as priorities for progress by the international community toward the 21st century:

First, the safeguarding of world peace and security. The utmost effort must be made on a global scale to successfully eliminate seats of political confrontation, eradicate the sense of distrust existing between different states, and establish a security system which prevents military conflicts so as to ensure as a result the triumph of an international climate which would allow all citizens to live peacefully and with confidence in the future;

Second, the safeguarding of freedom and democracy. People should have every right to express their views on the basis of their convictions. These views should be respected and should be capable of being realized by democratic means;

Third, worldwide prosperity should be safeguarded by an open market economy system. We must strengthen and support the multifaceted system of free trade in every possible way, pressuring and combating the protectionism that threatens it and undermines its principles;

Fourth, the environment should be preserved, not only in a natural sense, but in a social sense too. Questions of nature conservation and the fight against drugs, international terrorism, and so forth are becoming a global problem for mankind that threatens all of civilization;

Fifth and last, stable international relations should be ensured on the basis of dialogue and consensus. All political problems between East and West, between North and South, and among states in general should be resolved not by force but on the basis of dialogue and consensus.

Summing up these components as comprising the concept of "goodwill diplomacy," I will make every effort to promote the formation of such an international order.

On the basis of these positions, Japan intends to step up still further its participation in the general world economic development process. In this respect I would highlight aid to the East European countries, as well as the concept of international cooperation. This comprises three elements—collaboration for the sake of peace, increased government aid for development, and wider international cultural exchanges. Our country has started implementing this concept since the year before last, and I would like to focus on its provisions.

First, collaboration for the sake of peace. Guided by the desire to actively participate in the peaceful resolution of local conflicts, Japan's diplomatic efforts have been aimed at implementing various peacemaking missions, promoting UN peacekeeping activities, granting aid to refugees, and so forth. As the number two contributor of financial subsidies to the United Nations, Japan allocates funds to implement UN peacekeeping operations in Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Namibia, and the Central American countries and takes part in UN election monitoring missions.

As for increasing government development aid, here it should be noted that Japan is the world's largest donor to the developing countries, allocating around $10 billion a year for these purposes. Through our financial participation, which today spreads to many parts of the world, we are striving to make a concrete contribution to economic development, the raising of living standards, the elimination of poverty, and the training of skilled cadres in the developing countries.

With regard to the expansion of international cultural exchanges, we view this direction as a way to strengthen mutual understanding on a global scale. But not only this. It is no less important to preserve the world's cultural legacy and pass it on to future generations.

Moreover, we intend to make vigorous efforts to solve environmental problems, which are of global importance.

Everything I have said applies mainly to international problems. Now, if you will permit, I would like to say a few words about domestic affairs. In today's Japan, despite its rapid economic growth and obvious achievements in this area, there is an annoying contradiction between public prosperity and its impact on everyone's lives. During their childhood and youth the Japanese devote all their time and effort to study and lessons, when mature they are exclusively engaged in work, and only after retirement, when elderly, do people have leisure and spare time. But many of them don't know how to use that time. To a certain extent their full human life has been deformed—that is the basic problem. In my view, the most important task now is to create conditions which would allow us to eliminate this imbalance and enrich the lives of each individual person. We should give them the freedom to display initiative and to choose their way of life, we must provide for their old age and improve the current position of women, who bear a heavy burden in rearing children and looking after the elderly.... All this should be the subject of priority attention and, on this basis, we have espoused the so-called "new life plan" in Japan, whose main slogan is "Cheerfulness, vitality, and happiness for all."

That is the general outline of our priorities in the foreign policy sphere and at home.

Question: The unusually dynamic nature of the processes, the speed of change, and the appearance of new and sometimes unexpected aspects are remarkable features of the current international climate. This faster pace of world politics is generating the most diverse responses ranging from rapturous receptions to fears of the "toppling" of the world order established over the past decades. What is Japan's philosophy about the challenge of the times? Given a choice between restraint and activeness, which do you prefer as prime minister?

Answer: I have already noted that, from my standpoint, the most important task for Japan at the moment is to make the most meaningful contribution to the task of channeling the changes now taking place into the global process of world restructuring. In terms of its content and approaches the course of goodwill diplomacy prefers activeness and constructiveness in solving international problems.

One of the components of this course is the recognition that the extensive progress of reform in the East European countries—reform aimed at struggling to create regimes based on freedom, democracy, and the market economy—affects not only the European situation but the main constructs of the postwar international order. Japan will take part in seeking out this route, cooperating with other Western countries, and aiming ultimately to achieve glittering new prospects for the entire international community.

During my recent trip to Europe I announced a plan of economic aid measures to Poland and Hungary adopted by our cabinet. This plan should promote the modernization and development of these countries' economies and become the key to democratization and the raising of both peoples' prosperity. Specifically, Japan is offering these countries around $25 million over five years within the framework of technological cooperation in the economic management sphere. Poland is also getting aid for its so-called national currency stabilization fund, as well as emergency food aid. Moreover, both countries will be allocated $500 million each over three years by the Japanese Export-Import Bank.

As for the other East European countries, we will monitor the progress of reform and transformation in them and, in consultation with the United States and the West European powers, act constructively as circumstances dictate. Thus, I think, Japan will be making its contribution to the cause of creating a new international order.

Now a few words about the Asia-Pacific region. IZVESTIYA readers are probably familiar with the forecasts claiming that the 21st century will be the Pacific century. This region is indeed developing at the most dynamic rate at present, and is becoming more and more important, in political and economic terms, in world affairs. However, the issues of peace in the Asia-Pacific region cannot be viewed in isolation from the overall, global international situation. And if we are talking about the start of progress toward a new world order on the principles of dialogue and consensus, this applies not only to Europe but also—and to the same extent—to the Asia-Pacific region. It is this process that I have in mind when I talk of the "need to spread the wave of change globally."

What problems will have to be solved along this path? In the Asia-Pacific region Japanese-Soviet relations have still not been normalized and various political confrontations and open conflicts that act as factors of instability—such as the situation on the Korean Peninsula or the Cambodia situation—remain unresolved. The priority task, in my view, is to ensure the speediest settlement of these political confrontations and conflicts and to establish relations of trust between states. This is the shortest route to peace and stability in the region. In this respect it should be recalled that in Europe in the early seventies political questions between Germany and the USSR and between Poland and Germany were largely resolved, and in the late seventies the Helsinki process—the logic of whose development has led to the current multifaceted relations on that continent—was started.

Japan is seriously involved in resolving regional problems which hinder the creation of trust among the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. In particular, the question of the situation on the Korean Peninsula depends on dialogue between representatives of North and South, and that is why we are trying to make as much of a contribution as we can to creating suitable

conditions and a suitable atmosphere for such a dialogue. Incidentally, we are striving to improve relations with the DPRK and have been initiating contacts with that country since the year before last in the hope that the reaction to our proposals will be constructive. On the Cambodia problem, which is the largest factor of instability in Southeast Asia, Japan is making vigorous efforts to achieve a comprehensive resolution of this conflict. For instance, on 4-5 June Japan organized a conference of the interested parties in Tokyo to accelerate the progress of dialogue among them. The conference ended with the signing of a joint communique by Prince Sihanouk and Mr. Hun Sen. In this connection I would like to note that we make a positive assessment of your country's position on a political settlement in Cambodia and of the progress in normalizing relations between the USSR and the Korean Republic.

The Japanese and Soviet foreign ministers and their deputies will continue joint consultations and exchanges of views on all these problems in the future in a spirit of openness, which is very useful for the establishment of peace and stability in the region and for the creation of a new international order.

Question: Last year it was officially announced that Soviet leader M. Gorbachev would visit Japan in 1991. The USSR president himself recently confirmed this intention, calling the Japan visit an important foreign policy task. There's still some time to go before the visit, but the foundations of the future talks are already being laid. There have been many proposals on this score. These are being attentively recorded by both sides, weighed up, and studied. The aspects which are discussed most often are the level of readiness displayed by Tokyo and Moscow to get down to the nitty-gritty, the overall tenor of the Japanese-Soviet dialogue, and the climate of bilateral political relations. What could you say on this score? In what main direction, from the standpoint of Prime Minister Kaifu, should preparations for a future summit take place?

Answer: I have already talked about the need to spread the wave of change to the Asia-Pacific region in order to make the processes currently occurring in the world global in nature. That is why I believe that the improvement of Japanese-Soviet relations is of the utmost importance. The resolution of the task of getting them moving and comprehensively normalizing them is bound up with the prosperity and happiness of the two countries' peoples. In my view, it is the duty and obligation of the Soviet and Japanese leaders to make every effort to this end. Guided by these considerations, our country is striving to fundamentally improve relations with the Soviet Union.

In the December before last, during Foreign Minister Shevardnadze's visit to Japan, the Japanese side proposed setting up a work group at deputy foreign minister level to draw up a peace treaty aimed at resolving the most important outstanding question of the northern territories and the conclusion of a peace treaty between the two countries. A similar proposal was also made by the Soviet side, and as a result a group was set up and has already held four sessions.

In May last year, during the visit to USSR by then Japanese Foreign Minister Uno, we put to the Soviet side the concept of "balanced expansion," whose aim—while viewing the resolution of the territorial question and the conclusion of a peace treaty as the most important task—is also to expand in a balanced form all Japanese-Soviet relations, including the strengthening of confidence, exchanges of people, and other practical measures. Your leadership agreed with the concept in the main. Japan supports the direction in which perestroyka is developing—namely, democratization, liberalization, and the introduction of a market economy—and considers it correct. Last November and this April we were happy to receive Soviet delegations sent to Japan to study Japanese experience in the sphere of economic management for use in the future in the course of economic reform in your country.

Thus Japan, relying on the concept of "balanced expansion" and making concrete efforts to improve bilateral relations, is awaiting Mr. Gorbachev's visit. In a private message to me recently the USSR president, confirming that the visit will take place in 1991, wrote: "I am convinced that the planned meeting of the top Soviet and Japanese leaders in 1991 could be an important landmark in Soviet-Japanese relations and could give them new quality." I make a high assessment of this position of the president's and I intend to thoroughly discuss ways of normalizing our relations and fundamentally improving them during his visit.

Just what should the two countries' leaders do to achieve this? I have already noted that, for my part, I will be making every effort—but I mean by this not the kind of dramatic push that can move mountains, but purposeful steps which would allow us to gradually move forward, using as a guide our clear-cut ideas of what future relations between the two countries should be like and what place they should occupy in the overall international context of the 21st century. I think that it would be useful for us to think jointly about this now so as to realize these prospects.

Question: What would you like the world to look like in 10-15 years' time, Prime Minister? What will Japan be like then and what will its role in international affairs be? What will relations with your neighbors and the geographically closest of them—the USSR—be like?

Answer: As I see it, in the international community of the 21st century East-West confrontation will be transformed into dialogue and cooperation, and the difference between North and South will gradually change into a fair distribution of wealth on a global scale. Within this overall trend, I think, Japanese-Soviet relations should enter a new phase which will reveal all the potential opportunities offered by development.

To this end, first, a peace treaty which would be the basis of genuinely trusting relations between Japan and the Soviet Union must be signed. Unfortunately, at the moment the question of the northern territories remains unresolved between our countries. This could be said to be a throwback to World War II, as a result of which our countries have not signed a peace treaty. However, just because this problem is hard to solve we should not exclude this question from the agenda or leave it to future generations. On the contrary, we should solve this problem through good sense and serious political dialogue between the two peoples rather than leaving today's throwbacks to the next generation—that should be our task. When the territorial question is resolved and a peace treaty signed the basis for mutual trust between our peoples will be unshakable.

On the basis of this treaty—and this is the second point—comprehensive ties in the economy, science, technology, the cultural sphere, and ties and contacts between people will develop dynamically in accordance with the two countries' considerable potential. Under these conditions there will be opportunities for Japanese-Soviet economic relations to rise to the same level as Japanese-U.S. ties in trade and the economy, exchanges between people will develop at all levels, numerous Japanese-language schools will appear in the USSR—as will Russian-language schools in Japan—and genuine mutual understanding of the partner's culture and traditions will emerge.

And, third, our future relations will not be restricted to the bilateral framework, they will serve the entire Asia-Pacific region and the entire international community as a whole, promoting the development of a dialogue of mutual understanding and cooperation for the sake of universal peace and prosperity.

The building of Japanese-Soviet relations of this kind is not an illusion. I am convinced that, if we gradually resolve the existing unresolved problems, this aim is attainable. In order to allow us to pass on dependable relations and glittering prospects to future generations, Japanese and Soviet politicians should be highly responsible about making the utmost effort right now. Guided by these thoughts, we and the Soviet Union are conducting preparatory work to ensure that USSR President Gorbachev's visit to Japan is of genuinely historic importance in our relations.

Perestroyka, Changes Inspire Tokyo Antiwar Rally

OW2006083890 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Dispatch by correspondent Potapov from Tokyo on antiwar rally on 17 June]

[Text] Many people crowded into the outdoor music hall at the Ueno Park under the heat of nearly 30 degrees [Celsius] of scorching sun at noon on 17 June. People arrived with family members or by themselves. Gathered at the hall were members of antiwar, democratic, or women's organizations; labor unions and local organization; noted authors and scholars; and also students. In addition, antiwar activists from Hiroshima, Okinawa, and neighboring prefectures had come to Tokyo.

One speaker after another who went up to the platform stated that thanks to perestroyka, great changes had taken place in the East European nations as well as the world as a whole, and great advances had been made in the disarmament between the Soviet Union and the United States and in the reduction of nuclear arms. Moreover, speakers pointed out that the remarks on the existence of a threat from the Soviet Union were groundless, and they strongly denounced the military policy pursued by the Liberal Democratic Party.

Participants in the rally called on the antiwar forces in Japan to further carry on their movement to strongly oppose the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty and the deployment of the U.S. forces in Japan so as to promote peace and security in the Asian-Pacific region. In greeting the 30th anniversary of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty on 23 June, various activities, including rallies, symposiums, and conferences on such issues as security, were held in Tokyo last week under the sponsorship of about 40 antiwar and antinuclear arms organizations. And the current antiwar rally was held to conclude activities.

As has been pointed out in newspapers and magazines as well as in television discussions, the security treaty has caused apprehensions among the Japanese people, and it also indicates that the Japanese Government has taken a course contrary to the favorable trend in the world because it has refused to reduce its military expenditures while strengthening its military ties with the U.S. Department of Defense. And dietmen from the opposition parties have expressed similar apprehensions in their demands submitted to the government.

To suppress such an antiwar trend so as to make the U.S. Government feel at ease, the Japanese Foreign Ministry has issued a note stating that Japan has no intention of changing its approach toward the security treaty. The Japanese Government is expected to send Shintaro Abe as the prime minister's special envoy to visit the United States on 19 June so as to strengthen its military ties with the United States as much as possible and to pledge an increase in Japan's share of the expenditures for maintaining the U.S. forces stationed in Japan. Mr. Abe is also scheduled to attend ceremonies celebrating the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Japan-U.S. Security Treaty.

Joint Friendship Congress Meets in Tokyo

OW1606022390 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1200 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The 16th congress of the Japan-USSR Parliamentary Friendship Association opened in Tokyo on 2 June. The following report on this is from Potapov, the Moscow Radio correspondent in Tokyo:

This Japan-USSR Parliamentary Friendship Association, having about 400 Japanese dietmen as members, is a large organization for the purpose of promoting friendship between Japan and the Soviet Union. The congress this year was held with the specific objective of actively promoting dialogue and exchanges between Japan and the Soviet Union in extensive areas.

Mr. Yoshio Sakurauchi, former foreign minister and current speaker of the house of representatives, noted in his opening speech that the world is clearly moving toward disarmament, peace and the alleviation of tension, and that the congress is being held as major changes are being seen in the international situation.

Speaker Sakurauchi further pointed out the importance of how Japanese-Soviet relations should develop under this situation. It is necessary that bilateral relations be strengthened and that the visit to Japan by President Gorbachev be a major axis in the bilateral relations, he stressed.

The Japan-USSR Parliamentary Friendship Association proposed making the association's tasks providing help so that President Gorbachev's visit is a success and promoting activities so that neighborly relations and mutual understanding between Japan and the Soviet Union may be further strengthened. The participants supported the proposal.

This congress was attended by a delegation from the Supreme Soviet which was visiting Tokyo, and also by Soviet Ambassador to Japan Solovyev. Deputy Nikolay Danilyuk, who heads the Supreme Soviet delegation, spoke at the congress and conveyed a message of greetings from a group of deputies which has recently been formed to promote exchanges with the Diet. The group now has 193 deputies as members.

Deputy Danilyuk noted with satisfaction the progress being made between the Soviet Union and Japan in their political dialogue, and pointed out that this dialogue relationship is not only being strengthened, but is also gaining depth and many layers. What is important now is to have an environment of mutual respect so that both sides can freely and actively exchange their views regardless of whether the views coincide or not.

Mr. Danilyuk urged that exchanges between the Soviet Union and Japan be elevated to a high level not only in such large-scale activities as trade and economic cooperation, but also in visits among individuals.

Mr. Minobe Mizuno, general secretary of the Japan-USSR Parliamentary Friendship Association, granted an interview to Moscow Radio. He said, thanks to the active dialogue between the Soviet Union and the United States, everything is moving toward alleviation of tension and arms reduction. [passage omitted]

There are important events due to happen in Japan. This year Soviet Foreign Minister Shevardnadze is due to visit Japan. President Gorbachev will visit next year. The Japan-USSR Parliamentary Friendship Association regards the association's major task as preparation of the necessary conditions for these visits to be carried out successfully.

Japanese Ambassador Received at Foreign Ministry

PM1806160590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[TASS report under the general heading "Talks at the USSR Foreign Ministry"]

[Text] On 14 June, A.A. Obukhov, USSR deputy foreign minister, received Sumio Edamura, Japanese ambassador to the USSR, in connection with the imminent presentation of his credentials.

Japanese Journal on Northern Territories Founded

OW1906084190 Moscow in Japanese to Japan 1000 GMT 16 Jun 90

[From the "Soviet Far East News" program]

[Excerpts] Next, we will broadcast a Yuzhno-Sakhalinsk dispatch on KYODO TSUHO [BULLETIN ON COOPERATION], a new journal published in Sakhalin.

A few days ago, the first issue of KYODO TSUHO, an organ for the Sakhalin Society on the Studies of Sakhalin and the Kurile Islands as well as the Sakhalin Branch of the All-Union Cultural Fund, was published in Sakhalin.

(Mikhail Lizotov), candidate for doctor of history and KYODO TSUHO chief editor, speaks as follows:

[(Lizotov) is heard speaking briefly in Russian fading into Japanese translation] KYODO TSUHO is an organ to be published several times in a year. Starting with the first issue, we will publish the Russian translation of a book which was published in Oxford in 1974, and authored by (Lyon Stephen), American historian and professor of the University of Hawaii in the United States. It is entitled: "The Kuril Islands, Borders Between Russia and Japan in the Pacific".

This book has been kept a secret in the Soviet Union for many years. Whenever quotations from this book were published in outlines, the writer used to criticize Prof. (Stephen)'s views as an attempt at fabricating history merely because his views were different in many points from the nation's official interpretation of certain periods of the history of the Far East. However, thanks to glasnost, the openness policy, readers in Sakhalin can now make an appropriate appraisal of the book written by a very impartial and faithful scholar. The Russian translation of the book will be published continuously in the first four issues. [passage omitted]

The second issue exclusively will contain articles related to the so-called northern territorial issue. First, the journal will publish a report on the discussion on the issue conducted by historians in Sakhalin. This will include not only official measures but also a full record

of the discussions conducted among scholars and experts who have differing views on the issue.

In addition, the issue will publish full texts of all the treaties and agreements on the territorial issue signed between Russia and Japan and also between the Soviet Union and Japan. Because the details of these treaties never have been published in any popular publications, only a limited number of people are familiar with the details. All these documents probably will expand the views and deepen the understanding of the Soviet people on the situation concerning the territorial issue in the Far East since the signing of the peace treaty in San Francisco.

The second issue will also carry the Russian translation of Kita-Ezo-Ki [account on northern Hokkaido, Sakhalin, and Kuril Islands], the account of Sakhalin exploitation written by Linzo Mamiya, who is well known in Japan. The book is translated by (Valeriy Perestrachov), research worker at the Joint Oblast Museum. As the book advocates the political principle on Russia's historical preferential right in a nonsensical way, the name of Linzo Mamiya is not known to Soviet readers. Therefore, no notice has been taken of the explorer's contributions in the survey of Sakhalin and the basins of the Armur during the 19th century. [passsge omitted]

Near East & South Asia

Israeli Readiness for Peace Talks Questioned

TA1906192590 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Hebrew 1500 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Announcer-read commentary by Aleksandr Kushnir]

[Text] Aleksandr Kushnir writes that as is well known, Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhaq Shamir claims that he is ready for negotiations with the Palestinians. But those who believe that we have finally reached an opportunity to extricate the Middle East peace process from stalemate are mistaken. That is because the Israeli prime minister tied his agreement to negotiations to conditions that eliminate any chance for a Palestinian affirmative response.

Shamir said, among other things, that the Middle East peace process must once and for all end any chance of PLO participation, and that he is prepared to talk only with Palestinians who back the Israeli peace plan for elections in the West Bank and the Gaza Strip. We will not talk to them about a permanent settlement; if they want to discuss the establishment of a Palestinian state now, we have no need to enter into negotiations with them, Shamir said. That means that the Israeli prime minister forestalls any chance for Israeli-Palestinian negotiations before they have even begun. We cannot believe that the Palestinians want to enter into negotiations with Israel so much that they are prepared to give up their legal rights, which are recognized by the international community and supported by all countries around the world, Aleksandr Kushnir writes.

It is also not realistic to hope that the Israeli leadership will succeed in eliminating the PLO as a vital factor in any Middle East peace process. The organization is the recognized leader of the Palestinian people. It is recognized as such both by the Arab countries and the United Nations. PLO leader Yasir 'Arafat and his close associates are in favor of an accord with Israel on the basis of mutual recognition of the legal rights and interests of all the elements involved in the conflict. That gives the State of Israel the opportunity to gain the recognition of the Arab countries, thereby creating a basis to assure the security of its borders.

Does it make sense for Israel to reject the historic chance to achieve peace after 42 years of wars, and end the situation of tension and conflict in the Middle East? Another question should now be asked: Are the Likud and Yitzhaq Shamir personally really interested in a just and stable peace, or do they view the people of Israel as cannon fodder to advance the vision of a Greater Israel through territorial conquests and annexation? Aleksandr Kushnir writes.

We, of course, do not wish to project an image of being omnipotent, of appearing to know everything and decide on everything.

It is Israel's internal affair to decide what is important: whether it prefers peace or territories, defense within the Green Line borders or the continuation of the conflict within the borders of Greater Israel, to become part of the Middle East or to continue to be despised as the bridgehead of the Western camp in that strategic area.

I believe, concludes Aleksandr Kushnir, that the extremist leaders in Israel must stop trying to test the tolerance of the Arab world which is potentially much stronger than Israel. They must stop inciting the entire international community. At a time when the cold war is in recess, Israel can no longer plan on exploiting the differences between the USSR and the United States. Now that Washington understands that there is no need for the Likud's ultra-hardline policy, the Israeli Government must take a more realistic position. The international community will never agree to Israel's destruction, but it will also not agree to having Israel abort UN resolutions and annex countries which do not belong to it.

Notable Increase in Emigrants to Israel Noted

LD2006085790 Moscow TASS in English 0852 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The number of people leaving the USSR for Israel increased more than 12 times in 1989 as compared with 1985, PRAVDA reports today.

Ilya Karakulko, deputy chief of the Moscow visa office, said there have been few refusals of late. Only eleven out of the 1,764 people were denied exit visas in the first quarter of this year. The reasons are mainly knowledge of state secrets or a criminal investigation.

Karakulko said the Moscow visa office was recently addressed by managers of the Alexeyev worsted factory. They informed the visa office that the chairman of one of the cooperatives at the factory drew a loan of 200,000 roubles. Only a quarter of the work undertaken had been done, and the quality was inferior. And now he intends to emigrate to Israel.

Gorbachev Greets Reelected Israeli CP Leaders

PM1906112390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Second Edition p 1

[M. Gorbachev undated message to Israeli Communist Party leaders]

[Text] To Comrade Meir Vilner, chairman of the Israeli Communist Party, and Comrade Tawfiq Tubi, general secretary of the Israeli Communist Party Central Committee

Dear comrades, please accept my cordial congratulations in connection with your election to the leading posts in the Israeli Communist Party.

I wish you success in your work for the benefit of the Israeli people and in the interests of peace and socialism.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Potential for Iran, Iraq Leaders' Meeting Viewed

NC2006091190 Moscow in Persian to Iran 1700 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Yuriy Andreyev commentary from "The World Today" feature]

[Text] Dear listeners: Iranian and Iraqi officials have begun to prepare for a meeting between the presidents of the two countries. This was stated by Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani during a news conference in Mashhad. Our commentator Yuriy Andreyev writes:

It seems that spring has come to Iranian-Iraqi relations in recent months. However, as is usual during this season, the political atmosphere is changeable. Breezes of hope for positive developments suddenly die down, and dark threatening clouds are seen on the political horizon.

After a long and heartrending impasse, Tehran and Baghdad took some steps toward each other a few months ago. The Iraqi leader sent two letters to the Islamic government in which he called for a summit meeting. Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani stated in early June that he was ready to hold peace talks with Saddam Husayn. The Iranian president also pointed out that consultations at the expert level should be held first to ensure the meeting's success and that these consultations should be accompanied by consultations with the UN secretary general.

These consultations started immediately. Perez de Cuellar held meetings with the Iranian and Iraqi representatives at the United Nations. But then suddenly the situation became more complicated. After a month of cautious silence between the two sides, a war of nerves broke out once again. 'Ali Shamkhani, commander of the Iranian Navy, publicly announced that any attempt to secure the passage of Italian-made warships into the Persian Gulf would be thwarted. 'Ali Shamkhani's hostile remarks provoked a very regrettable reaction from Baghdad, which pointed out that the Iraqi Government was not intimidated by threats and would act as it saw fit.

It seemed that prospects for the normalization of Iranian-Iraqi relations had started to dim. At the last moment, however, Iran and Iraq controlled their feelings and stopped short of the abyss. Apparently the two countries' diplomats exerted great efforts behind the scenes and achieved results. In his news conference in Mashhad, Iranian President 'Ali Akbar Hashemi-Rafsanjani stated that Iranian and Iraqi representatives have begun preliminary prepartions for the meeting between the two countries' presidents. The Iranian president also pointed out that a peace pact can only be signed with Baghdad if UN Security Council Resolution 598 is fully implemented.

No information is being released about the current consultations between Iran and Iraq. Nothing is known about the agenda for the summit or even its venue. Saddam Husayn had proposed that the meeting take place in Mecca, but Tehran, which does not have diplomatic relations with Saudi Arabia and describes Riyadh as the junior center of corruption, has rejected this idea.

In short, the two sides are still trying to solve the problem to their own advantage but at least they are wasting less energy. It seems that the idea that a compromise is necessary is gaining ground in Tehran and Baghdad.

Iraq Criticizes Iranian Threat of Naval Blockade

NC2006094590 Moscow Radio Peace and Progress in Persian to Iran 1530 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Station commentary]

[Text] Baghdad has condemned Iran's threats to impose a naval blockade on Iraq. The problem arose when some Iranian dignitaries made statements about the possibility of basing Iranian submarines in the Persian Gulf to prevent Iraqi military and civilian ships from using this strategic waterway.

In response to these statements, INA has pointed out that Iraq has the right of free navigation. The news

agency writes that such a step by Iran would be extremely serious and could destroy the existing compromise and reconciliation. The news agency noted that Iraq, like Iran and the other countries in the region, has the right to free navigation in the Strait of Hormuz. Our commentator writes:

Iran and Iraq have different stands on freedom of navigation in the Shatt al-'Arab or Arvand Rud which flows into the Persian Gulf. As we know, the violation of the 1975 Algiers accord by the Iraqi leadership was one of the pretexts for the Iran-Iraq war. This accord places the border between the two countries down the middle of the said river. Baghdad considers this accord to be invalid because it was signed by the former shah of Iran and wants its territory to extend to Iranian shores. Iran, however, insists on adhering to the Algiers accord.

All discussions about the border river have taken the form of the confrontation that has been continuing between the two sides since the outset of the war, thus making the river an insurmountable obstacle. If this situation remains unchanged, then even the reaching of a peace agreement will not enable the two sides to use this important waterway for their mutual benefit, joint economic and commercial cooperation, or other forms of cooperation. But both countries need cooperation. The river is an easy means of communication between the two countries. Undoubtedly the establishment of commercial and cultural ties through the use of the river can strengthen peace and goodneighborly relations between Iran and Iraq and can remove suspicion and [word indistinct] in relations between the two countries.

In view of this, Iran's efforts to solve the problem of the river (?to its benefit) through a naval blockade is a great error. Such an act would threaten the cease-fire and could lead to the resumption of military operations. During the war, the Iranian Navy's efforts to block Iraqi ports with the help of naval and air attacks on vessels carrying cargo to Iraq did not yield favorable results. These efforts led only to the expansion of the foreign military presence in the Persian Gulf, which resulted in the confrontation between the U.S. and Iranian Navies. During this confrontation, Iran suffered heavy material and human losses.

I think that the two sides would achieve much better results through compromise and mutual understanding in solving the issue of free navigation. The prospects for a solution are brighter today than ever before; and (?it is because of this) that the two countries' presidents have expressed their readiness to meet so that they can find a solution to the problems which still divide Iran and Iraq.

TASS Correspondent Dies in Accident in Iraq

LD1906100390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0935 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)—Aleksandr Bolmatov, TASS correspondent in the Republic of Iraq, died tragically in a road accident in Baghdad on 17 June. This gifted international journalist, who had worked in several Arab countries, lost his life while carrying out his professional duty.

Sub-Saharan Africa

Commentary Views Summit Discussion on Africa

MB1406152590 Moscow in English to Southern Africa 1900 GMT 13 Jun 90

[Vladimir Serov commentary—read by announcer]

[Text] Yesterday, at the session of the Supreme Soviet, the USSR parliament, President Mikhail Gorbachev reported on the recent Soviet-American summit.

This meeting of the two presidents has become a major event in international affairs. According to the opinion of observers, it has great meaning for the situation on our planet and for the internal processes taking place in the Soviet Union. A great deal of attention was paid, during the talks, to the regional problems in the world.

A reaction from Vladimir Serov, who writes this:

Examining the parliamentary responses to the speech by President Gorbachev, I pay particular attention to one of them, where it was said the political rivalry and confrontation between the USSR and the USA is changing into (?one of) cooperation in the interest of stabilizing peace on earth.

In my opinion, these changes in the relations between the two countries are now being clearly looked at and also their approach to regional problems. As noted by the Soviet president, it was only quite recently that the regional conflicts were the source of serious complications in Soviet and U.S. relations. The atmosphere of confrontation in nearly every such conflict holds the reason for strengthening the confrontation between the East and the West. All that went on in the world then was seen through the prism of this confrontation.

As I see it, continued Vladimir Serov, Africa can serve as a sufficiently clear illustration of such confrontation and it's consequences. It only took an African country to announce its choice of socialism, and this automatically insured it of empathy from the Soviet Union and suspicion from the United States. Each seeing Africa as its sphere of influence, each side tried to squeeze a (?triumph) whether it was a conflict in the horn of Africa or the internal political contradictions in Angola.

The two great nations dragged the African countries into the orbit of their confrontation. One of them accused the other of carrying out American imperialism on the continent, while the other talked about Soviet expansionism. However, each one gradually came to see that the African problem would be much easier to solve by using [word indistinct] from both sides instead of playing all this in their mutual enmity. It needed a fairly long period accompanied by changes in the Soviet Union,

America, and Africa, and a new political thinking for all to become clear that it wants forthwith to use the confrontational approach to resolve international and regional problems.

In essence, the changes that had taken place in recent times involved the two great nations no longer looking at regional conflicts as an object of rivalry between them. President Gorbachev says that now both sides see the regional conflict as a calamity for those countries involved and as a negative phenomenon on the international scene.

There is a general understanding of the necessity to do all, so that conflicts can be quickly brought to an end, where the [words indistinct] been made, not in the field of battle, but by political means and through talks. Such an approach has already brought significant positive results. The inclusion of the Soviet Union and the United States in the search for a settlement in South-West Africa led to the withdrawal of South Africa's forces from Namibia and the Cubans throughout Angola, which led to the holding of the first free elections in Namibia, after which the last colony in Africa became an independent state. The process of reform is moving in the Republic of South Africa, which logically should lead to the creation of a democratic and nonracial society.

President Gorbachev gave assurance about this when he said there were practically no differences between the USSR and the USA on South Africa, and both sides will develop contacts with all forces and take part in the search for just decisions on the region's difficult problems.

But a positive result (?achieved) at the Soviet-American Summit was the agreement by both countries on the question of showing practical aid to Ethiopia. A joint communique was issued about this; in particular, it mentions the positive measures and supplying food to the hungry population in the north of the country. As mentioned yesterday by President Gorbachev, the joint conference on Ethiopia, the first humanitarian action to be taken together and help to bring peace to that country, racked by hunger and civil wars. [sentence as heard]

On the whole, it can be said that in relation to regional conflicts, the way has been taken from rivalry to mutual understanding and now to mutual interaction. It also is the interest of the Soviet people that serve to improve international relations as a whole.

Ethiopian Rebels Threaten Food Supply Aircraft

PM1906111790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 5

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA correspondent G. Ustinov: "Ethiopia: Famine as a Weapon? Aircraft Carrying Food Supplies Threatened by Missiles"]

[Text] Addis Ababa—According to the latest estimates, 4.5 million Ethiopians will not be able to last out until the 1991 harvest without help. Such are the consequences of the present drought, which has hit one-third of the country's territory.

In terms of scale, it is equivalent to the 1984-1985 drought, which was described as catastrophic and carried off a million lives despite all the efforts of the world community to support Ethiopia during its difficult time.

Addis Ababa has been visited by many prominent representatives of the world community, government delegations, and religious figures. All of them have become acquainted with the situation in Ethiopia, met its leaders, and sought ways and possibilities of giving support to the Ethiopian people.

Some major aid sources are already established. The United States, Canada, and the EEC are prepared to send very substantial food consignments here. It seems that everything is being done so as not to leave Ethiopia alone in its misfortune and to prevent the specter of famine from becoming a reality. Despite this, however, the present situation is radically different from what it was five years ago. Unfortunately, this change is for the worse. A civil war is raging in the Republic. A large part of its territory—the very part that has been hit by the drought hardest of all—is under the control of two opposition groupings: the Eritrean People's Liberation Front (EPLF) and the Tigre People's Liberation Front (TPLF).

The situation is particularly difficult in Eritrea, where 2.5 million people live and where the sun has scorched all the fields. Food supplies could be transported there via the Red Sea port of Mits'iwa or by aircraft to the city of Asmera. However, both these population centers are at the very heart of the civil war. In February this year, the port of Mits'iwa was seized by rebels. Until recently, the government did not allow ships carrying any freight—food supplies included—to call at this port. In its turn, the Eritrean opposition blockaded the airport at Asmera, firing missiles at approaching aircraft and the runway.

One result of the recent meeting between the Soviet and U.S. presidents was an accord on transporting U.S. food supplies to Asmera on Soviet aircraft. At the same time, the Ethiopian Government announced that it would no longer prevent ships carrying food supplies from entering Mits'iwa port. These are important decisions. They could greatly ease the situation. However, EPLF radio has said that the Soviet aircraft could carry arms and ammunition into besieged Asmera together with humanitarian aid and that consequently they will be destroyed by missiles. The EPLF has also rejected the Ethiopian government proposal to start peace talks on the Eritrean question with United Nations participation.

The blockade ring around the Eritrean capital of Asmera tightens with every day. Inside the city, its 350,000 inhabitants and a large proportion of the 180,000-strong Second Revolutionary Army are starving. There is no fuel: It too is brought in from outside. The city's water

supply line works only once a week. Lights are switched on briefly twice a week. But the most important thing is that the already meager food supplies are rapidly running out.

Has famine really become a weapon in the civil war? Representatives of the Ethiopian and world community are asking this question in alarm. Having made important compromises with the opposition, the country's government is prepared to take other steps to meet it halfway. It is now essential that the EPLF follow this example. All ambition must retreat before the word "bread."

Internal Ugandan Situation Remains 'Difficult'

EA1506103590 Moscow International Service in Amharic 1530 GMT 11 Jun 90

[Text] Although the activities of antigovernment groups have ended in Uganda's northwestern border area, the country's internal situation is said to remain difficult. Vladimir Borisov comments:

The current problem encountered by Yoweri Museveni's government is the intensification of the activities of the prohibited political parties. Political figures who used to support the Idi Amin and Milton Obote dictatorships say openly that they are dissatisfied with the present government. Yoweri Museveni's decision to extend his term of office by five years has angered many people. The opposition parties want to seek power by way of democratic elections, but the Museveni government is afraid of holding elections in the absence of a sound political infrastructure.

It will be recalled that in the past, civil wars repeatedly erupted in Uganda following democratic elections. But since the opposition parties have been denied action by way of legally established machinery, they have been forced to engage in clandestine action to weaken the regime. The Kampala government's response to this has been to arrest people. The government has arrested the minister of youth, culture, and sports, Moses Ali, alleging that he had organized an antigovernemnt rally.

Uganda's economy is facing difficulties. Last year the country's industrial growth reached 17 percent and many roads were repaired. The Ugandan masses say they have not observed much change. There is the problem of inflation. In 1987 $1 was worth 60 Ugandan shillings. Now, $1 is equivalent to 370 Ugandan shillings. Corrupt government officials constitute a major problem for Ugandans. Although the government claims to be fighting bribery, it has not succeeded. The fall of the price of coffee on the international market has exacerbated Uganda's economic problems. Uganda gets 97 percent of its foreign exchange from coffee sales. Although the government has begun taking some steps, it is, however, very late.

The increasing number of southern Sudan refugees has brought another problem to the Kampala government. In general, the Uganda Government faces many problems, which need immediate solutions. Employment for those who leave military service, and reconstruction of war-torn areas are problems needing immediate attention. Any delay will exacerbate the problems. The Kampala government must also act to bring about economic and political reforms. The future of the government and the people depend on these reforms.

East Europe

GDR Volkskammer on German Unity, Constitution

PM1906160090 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report by PRAVDA correspondent M. Podklyuchnikov under the rubric "Calling Berlin": "Going Through the Right-Hand Door"]

[Text] Berlin, 18 Jun—However tight the schedule on which the "German unity train" is moving, forces are active on the inner-German political scene that would like to reach the objective not merely even more rapidly, but actually in the twinkling of an eye.

At yesterday's session of the GDR Volkskammer they showed that they would be prepared to take steps to that end that can only be called adventurist. The German Social Union faction took the initiative. Catching the majority of deputies unawares, it proposed the immediate adoption of a decision that the GDR should join the FRG on the basis of Article 23 of the West German Constitution "as of today."

The date from which the German Social Union faction would like to start reckoning the restoration of a united German state is no accident. Yesterday, political circles in the GDR and the FRG were marking the anniversary of the events that took place in the GDR on 17 June 1953—in the West this day was subsequently christened "German unity day."

In this connection 1,000 deputies of the Volkskammer and the FRG Bundestag held a joint session in the Berlin "Schauspielhaus" concert hall, at which GDR Prime Minister Lothar de Maiziere and Federal Chancellor Helmut Kohl sat side by side. Meanwhile a demonstration was taking place outside the entrance to the building, involving several hundred people. They waved flags with the GDR emblem and whistled at the West German parliamentarians. The demonstrators were demanding a referendum on the question of unification of the two German states.

Commenting on the proposal submitted by the German Social Union faction in the Volkskammer, the newspaper BERLINER ZEITUNG notes that if it was adopted the GDR parliament would have to dissolve forthwith—the FRG fundamental law stipulates the existence of only one parliament, the Bundestag.

Of course, things did not reach those extremes.

Nonetheless the question was put on the agenda and submitted for discussion. And although in principle the idea of a huge leap forward by the "German unity train" was not rejected, all the factions, after meeting for two hours to formulate their views, came out against it. Their reasons differed.

The prime minister called for moderation and restraint. In his opinion, first a second state treaty should be drawn up, outlining the framework for the GDR's entry into the FRG. Furthermore it is necessary beforehand to set up in the GDR state structures comparable to those in the FRG, that is, to restore the division of the country into separate Laender. The heads of government also drew attention to foreign aspects of the unification of the two German states.

Hans Modrow, honorary chairman of the Party of Democratic Socialism, spoke for the opposition. He pointed to the special national responsibility of the two German states. It is a question of the confidence of their neighbors and all the European peoples. The actions of the GDR government and parliament should be predictable.

The parliament did not throw out the German Social Union's proposal entirely, but referred it to the commissions for further discussion.

As a result of the decisions adopted by the Volkskammer recently, an unusual situation has arisen in the GDR—basically there is no constitution in operation in the country at present. The parties of the government coalition have already repealed a number of its provisions. At the same time they have refused to examine a draft new democratic constitution drawn up by the participants in the "roundtable" which was in operation prior to the 18 March parliamentary elections.

The recarving of the fundamental law continues—it is considered necessary to open the way to monetary, economic, and social union with the FRG. Yesterday the Volkskammer examined a draft law on a series of new amendments and additions to the Constitution. Everything that is still reminiscent of socialism is thrown overboard. Particular emphasis is placed on the protection of private property. But the question of the protection of public and cooperative property is entirely ignored.

When the time came to vote, the principle that was applied was what the press called "counting sheep." The deputies left the hall. Then those who were against came in through the left-hand door, those "for" through the right-hand door, and the abstentions through the middle door. The majority came in through the right-hand door.

GDR's Gysi Rejects Move Toward Center

PM2006091790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report under the "Official" rubric: "'We Will Remain Left-Wingers'"]

[Text] The unification of the two German states must help to develop integration processes in Europe and stability on the continent. This common conviction was voiced during the meeting in Moscow between representatives of the CPSU leadership and Gregor Gysi, chairman of the Party of Democratic Socialism [PDS]. Sharing his impressions of his conversation 15 June at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center, the guest from the GDR noted the considerable proximity in the sides' approaches to the assessment of the results of the Soviet-U.S. summit meeting and the recent Warsaw Pact Political Consultative Committee meeting.

According to G. Gysi, the interlocutors also agreed that there can be no question of any state's positions' prevailing in Europe or of any shift in the correlation of forces.

Do you not think, G. Gysi was asked, that the changes in the USSR and East Europe attest to the decline of socialism and a turn toward neoconservatism?

One can indeed, he pointed out, speak of a decline in Stalinist socialism—so-called real socialism. However, I have no intention of discrediting the concept of "socialism" altogether. I do not agree that the order that prevailed before the changes in our countries can be described as socialism. We are of, course, witnessing a weakening of left-wing forces, negative feelings, and tangled thinking, but I firmly believe that left-wingers are gaining new opportunities today.

In response to the question of PDS tactics and prospects in the all-German elections, G. Gysi noted: We are the only parliamentary party acknowledged as a left-wing party in either the GDR or the FRG. We will not move toward the center in order to achieve success; we will remain left-wingers.

Commander Confirms Naval Base Existence

AU1806183790 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 13-14 Jun 90 p 2

["Fed"-signed report: "The Base Exists"]

[Text] "Four missile boats and the same of number of antisubmarine-warfare craft equipped with torpedo launchers make up the Soviet small naval combatant brigade in Swinoujscie," said Captain 1st Rank Vladimir Kudryavtzev, commander of the base, on 12 June. This information was made public for the first time on 12 June: In theory the base has not existed until now.

Reportage on Normalizing of Bucharest Situation

Control Again in City

PM1906103790 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent V. Vedrashko: "Romania: Situation Under Control"]

[Text] Bucharest, 15 Jun—The past day and night have been relatively calm here. The city was controlled by 10,000 miners who came to Bucharest the day before to help the government, army, and police forces restore and maintain order.

Several newspapers were not published early in the morning, among them ROMANIA LIBERA—one of the largest central dailies—which has proved its opposition character of late with many articles. However, a considerable number of articles and reports in another central newspaper, ADEVARUL, have been devoted to the dramatic events of 13-14 June. Attention is drawn to an article about the miners. It says, in particular, that the miners' credo is "to ensure that the country has it good!" They came to the Romanian capital with this desire—for the third time since the revolution. The newspaper cites the words of President I. Iliescu urging miners not to use force. It then printed the words of engineer T. Iordache: "'He who sows the wind reaps the whirlwind.' After everything that the miners have seen in the city, their wrath will be hard to restrain."

By this evening the miners had gradually begun to leave Bucharest. In the afternoon journalists were called to a news conference. It was attended by Prime Minister P. Roman, National Defense Minister A.V. Stanculescu, and new Internal Affairs Minister D.V. Ursu.

In his statement the prime minister pointed to "the foreign mass media's incorrect coverage of the course of events in Bucharest" and voiced the hope that the current meeting would enable these distortions to be put right. He said, in particular, that the city had not seen the kind of excesses to which Bucharest has been subjected over the last few days in the last 40-50 years. In response to the question as to the real organizers of the disturbances, P. Roman noted, without naming any names, that the action was planned in advance. The prime minister said that gangs were formed and declasse elements, speculators, and various social parasites spearheaded their actions. The prime minister voiced regret at certain acts of violence that the miners committed in the city.

Illescu Greets Miners

PM1906110590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Dispatch by PRAVDA correspondent V. Vedrashko: "The Clashes Are Over. The Situation in the Romanian Capital Is Normalizing"]

[Text] Bucharest—Life in the Romanian capital is returning to normal after the pogroms, fires, and street battles between motorized army units and the police, on the one hand, and extremist formations, officially described in the country leadership's statements as "legionnaire-type" fascist gangs, on the other.

Practically all of the 10,000 miners have now left Bucharest after two days of efforts to establish order in the city. As a result, University Square, the main scene of the clashes, is now clear.

Radio reporters are tape-recording the normal hubbub of the traffic in the square almost as if it were a sensation. This is understandable. Only some 24 hours ago, near here, at the police headquarters, a fierce firefight was in progress.

Addressing a rally of several thousand miners in Bucharest, President Ion Iliescu thanked them for their devotion to the cause of the revolution.

Prime Minister Petre Roman declared that what happened in the center of the city was the "result of an operation designed to destabilize the political situation in the country." The police displayed weakness, he said, and added that its tasks in conditions of democracy are much more difficult than in conditions of dictatorship. Following the replacement of the minister of the interior, P. Roman said, there is hope that the police will become more efficient.

The liberal Freedom Party has denounced the "provocative actions aimed at destabilizing society." The Party of Free Democratic Youth has called for the "immediate establishment of law and order in the country" and urged all political and social organizations to grasp that "any destabilization in Romania is playing into the hands of hostile circles which may interfere in the country's internal affairs." The Socialist Justice Party has declared that "no one has a right to encroach on the gains of the people and no one will escape their true and fair judgement."

People's faces everywhere reflect an eager desire to gain a better understanding of the causes of the "earthquake" which took place 13 and 14 June, which has dealt a serious blow to public consciousness...

West Europe

Nikitin Receives Austrian Vice Chancellor

LD1806195790 Moscow TASS in English 1902 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—First Deputy Soviet Prime Minister Vladilen Nikitin met Austrian Vice-Chancellor Josef Riegler here today to discuss Soviet-Austrian cooperation.

The meeting was businesslike. The talks were attended by Austrian Ambassador to the Soviet Union Herbert Grubmayr.

Laverov on Austrian Ties, Technology Transfer

LD1906193290 Moscow TASS in English 1854 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Yuriy Novak and Yuriy Kozlov]

[Text] Vienna June 19 TASS—The improvement of the world's political climate, caused by radical changes under way in the Soviet Union, enables the USSR to expand its involvement in the international division of labour in science and engineering, Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Nikolay Laverov, who is also head of the USSR State Committee for Science and Technology, told a news conference here today.

Laverov heads a soviet delegation that arrived in Vienna to take part in the international conference on the transfer of technologies from educational establishments to industry.

Concerning prospects for the development of Soviet-Austrian cooperation, Laverov noted that the Soviet Union intended to strengthen and expand present relations, as well as to use Austria's potential as an international centre to establish scientific and economic contacts with other countries.

He said that the State Committee for Science and Technology was planning to hold, with the participation of interested ministries and departments, a Soviet science and technology festival in Austria in autumn.

An extensive exposition of Soviet scientific and technical achievements will be mounted in Vienna. The latest achievements of research centres, universities and individual enterprises, including in the defence industry, will be put on display. A life-size model of the orbital station "Mir" will be built to illustrate the Soviet space equipment's potential and commercial uses.

More on Hijacking of Helsinki-Bound Aircraft

LD1906163590 Moscow TASS in English 1553 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—A Tu-134 airliner of the Latvian Civil Aviation Department, carrying 54 passengers, including three children, and a crew of six, was forced to land at the international airport in Helsinki today, after hijackers threatened to blow it up.

The flight 8305 took off from Latvian capital Riga at 9:57 Moscow time and headed for Murmansk, Soviet Civil Aviation officials told TASS.

At 10:30, Aeroflot flight controllers received a report from the crew that three hijackers, threatening to blow up the airliner, demanded that it land in Stockholm.

Flight Commander Y. Kuzmin decided to change the course and cross the Soviet border, in order not to endanger human lives, they said.

The crew had no experience in international flights and were helped by pilots of a West German Cessna plane bound for Helsinki. The Cessna carried a Soviet specialist who translated exchanges between the two crews. Following the Cessna, the Soviet airliner touched down in Helsinki at 11:41.

Police are investigating the incident.

According to unconfirmed data, the hijackers initially planned to force the crew to fly to Sweden, from where they planned to move to Israel.

One of the hijackers, who turned himself in to Finnish authorities in Helsinki airport, has been identified as Oleg Kozlov, B. 1970.

The fake grenade he used to threaten the crew into changing the course was confiscated from him, Aeroflot officials in Helsinki told TASS.

Kozlov has asked for political asylum.

Under an agreement that came into effect in 1974, the Soviet Union and Finland agreed to cooperate in preventing hijack attempts. The agreement envisages extradition of hijackers.

All passengers are safe.

Criminal proceedings have begun in the incident. A Soviet Civil Aviation Ministry commission has been set up to investigate the matter.

Hijacker Said 'Acting Alone'

LD1906193490 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1840 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondents Voytto Leskinen and Aleksandr Surikov]

[Text] Helsinki, 19 Jun (TASS)—How many criminals were involved in hijacking the Aeroflot Tu-134 plane this morning and forcing its crew to make a landing in Helsinki? The whole of today was spent clearing up this question. In the end, the criminal police carrying out the investigation came to the conclusion that the terrorist was acting alone. A police spokesperson said at a press conference that the criminal had been detained and his interrogation would be continued. One of the passengers under suspicion had also been interrogated, but no evidence against him had been found.

At 2113 Moscow time, the plane took off from Helsinki-Vantaa Airport towards Murmansk, with all its passengers aboard excerpt for the one who had been detained. The police spokesperson refused to give his name.

Further Reports on Shevardnadze-Genscher Meetings

Joint Pact-NATO Goals Proposed

AU1906161790 Hamburg DER SPIEGEL in German 18 Jun 90 pp 21-22

[Unattributed report: "New Relationship"]

[Excerpts] The site of the conference stands for peace and the right to freely choose an alliance with others. When in October 1648 the Westphalia Peace Treaty was concluded, it put an end to the Thirty Years' War; the German princes and other estates of the [Holy Roman] Empire were permitted to conclude pacts with foreign states. With Muenster in Westphalia, Foreign Ministers Hans- Dietrich Genscher and his Soviet counterpart Eduard Shevardnadze have chosen a meeting place that is rich in history—just as eight days ago in the Belorussian border city of Brest. [passage omitted]

During the past few weeks, the two foreign ministers have had more meetings than ever before. According to Shevardnadze they are doing "donkey work" on the path toward German unity.

On Friday this week, they will meet again, namely at the second meeting of ministers within the framework of the "two-plus-four" talks in East Berlin. As in Brest and Muenster, the military status of a united Germany and its right to freely elect its alliances is once again on the agenda. Can or may a united Germany be a member of NATO?

The Soviets see the possibility for a compromise in a "new relationship" (Shevardnadze) between the two military blocks. How these should be transformed to political alliances is laid down in a paper with which the Soviet foreign minister surprised his FRG colleague in Brest.

In the two-page catalogue, whose existence has so far been concealed by Bonn, Shevardnadze lists a number of wishes:

—regular meetings between the heads of government, foreign and defense ministers, chiefs of staff, and parliamentarians;

—joint NATO and Warsaw Pact institutions;

—joint exercises and maneuvers of the long-estranged Armed Forces;

—"zones with reduced deployment of arms" to protect both sides against surprise attacks.

In addition, the Soviets expect NATO to also formally renounce first use of nuclear weapons—already suggested by U.S. Foreign Secretary James Baker—and to declare its support for a defensive military strategy. The best guarantee for this is a formal renunciation of strength. Bonn thinks that the proposals are "cleverly made." One will not be able to ignore many of its points. The proposal of an "associated membership" of Germany in NATO and Warsaw Pact, made by Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev last Tuesday, proves that Moscow is pressing for a modification of the blocks. [passage omitted]

Shevardnadze on Bilateral Ties

LD1906170290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] As we have already reported, a meeting between the USSR and FRG foreign ministers has taken place in the West German town of Munster. During the return flight from Munster to Moscow, Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze gave an interview to our special correspondent (Aleksandr Kulikovskiy). The USSR foreign minister said, in part:

[Begin Shevardnadze recording] It is very important that today we achieved good mutual understanding. As for relations between the military-political alliances or the states that are members of these alliances, I regard it as one of the most important achievements of our conversation that we have quite a good mutual understanding in that respect. If the NATO members and their leaders to meet in London make an adequate statement, adopt an adequate, worthwhile, and weighty declaration, which will match the declaration adopted in Moscow at the Warsaw Treaty meeting, I think we would be making significant progress. We would then consider the question of military-political status already in a new atmosphere. There may be interesting alternatives in the new conditions. In general, they have been indicated. When Mikhail Sergeyevich was addressing the Supreme Soviet, he named several alternatives, as it were. There may also be other alternatives, but everything will depend on how events develop. I stress, very much will depend on what happens at the London meeting of NATO states.

Questions of economic and bilateral cooperation as a whole were broached at Genscher's initiative. I must say that he put forward a rather detailed program of economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the future unified Germany. Naturally, he does not at the moment exclude current relations with the FRG and the German Democratic Republic. But, with a view to the future, he put forward very many interesting proposals. They concern scientific and technical cooperation, the joint handling of ecological problems, cooperation in the safety of nuclear power stations, and much else. A whole collection, as it were, of proposals that will require further study. [end recording]

All-Europe Security Discussed

PM1906171590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 20 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[Dispatch by IZVESTIYA special correspondents Ye. Bo'kun and M. Yusin: "Rapprochement of Positions Continues. On Results of Meeting Between E.A. Shevardnadze and H.-D. Genscher"]

[Text] Munster—In the increasingly full timetable of meetings between the Soviet and FRG foreign ministers, the conversation held 18 June in the West German city of Munster (the eighth this year) was only an interim step on the way to a balance of East-West interests.

The meeting in Munster was not expected to produce any sensations. Our foreign colleagues hanging around in the city hall waiting for the news conference tried to guess what generalities Genscher and Shevardnadze would use when opening their speeches to the journalists. Both ministers noted progress and a rapprochement of viewpoints after their six-hour conversation. Genscher expressed the hope that the questions of German unity will soon be resolved. Shevardnadze offered a specific prospect—the possibility of developing a new relationship between the Warsaw Pact and NATO as all-European structures change.

What are the chances of a compromise on the German issue after Munster? First, there is a real possibility of turning the military alliances into political organizations with the development of new relations between them. Second, prospects are emerging for forming an all-European council within the CSCE framework in order to organize regular meetings between heads of government, foreign ministers, and defense ministers from countries involved in the Helsinki process; also, the Vienna talks are making successful headway and border guarantees are becoming more reliable.

We think that as soon as this range of problems is resolved in the light of Eastern and Western interests, the problem of a united Germany's membership of a particular military bloc will lose its acuteness. Incidentally, the all-German army will not match the present Bundeswehr in terms of either size (it is proposed to scale it down to 400,000) or character. What kind of role will this army play in the defense of central Europe and what tasks will be assigned to the U.S. nuclear forces? FRG Defense Minister G. Stoltenberg proposes to replace the current principle of "forward borders" with the concept of "defense along borders." It is a question of conventional weapons. The contours of nuclear strategy in the NATO of the future are unclear at present. But, in any case, its nuclear forces (according to Stoltenberg) must serve less to deter a specific enemy and more to stabilize the bilateral security system.

If everything does develop in this direction, notions of the irreconcilability of NATO and the Warsaw Pact could give way to other categories of thinking. Why not suppose that the military blocs could unite to form a common alliance, or at least, to form a joint political organization of which a united Germany would be a member? The differences between the Soviet Union and the West which as yet prevent agreement from being reached regarding Germany's political status in fact are not so great. In principle, both sides want the same thing: to build a common system of security, cooperation, and partnership.

One of the authors managed to talk to E.A. Shevardnadze in the aircraft on the return journey from Munster to Moscow.

Speaking of the results of the recent talks, the minister described them as very useful and constructive. In his opinion, this primarily applies to the question of forming all-European structures: "Almost total unity of approach is emerging in the view taken of these problems by myself, Mr. Genscher, and the GDR leadership. This is an encouraging point," Shevardnadze said. "I would also point to the quite good mutual understanding on the question of the future of the military-political alliances. Our exchange of opinions made it possible to further elucidate each other's stand and move forward in the search for compromise. I would also like to highlight another point. A unique opportunity to secure a new political order in Europe has now opened up before us. This opportunity is very real. We simply do not have the right to miss it. I am sure that Genscher, Baker, and the heads of European countries' diplomatic departments are aware of this historic responsibility. A very great deal will also depend on the Soviet Union. Will we be able to continue to base our policy on the new thinking? After all, it is no secret that both in our country and abroad there are forces striving to prevent this. I nevertheless believe that we will be able to build a new, secure Europe."

The minister pins particular hopes—and he asked me to specially underline this—on the results of the meeting of NATO leaders to be held in London 5 July. Will the Western bloc adopt a "weighty, constructive declaration" consonant with the recent Moscow statement by the Warsaw Pact countries? If this is done, Europe will have the opportunity to build its future on a nonconfrontational basis.

Asked about the time scale and nature of the transitional period that will inevitably accompany German unification, Shevardnadze admitted that the Soviet Union and the FRG still have disagreements over this problem and that the Munster meeting failed to overcome them. The debate is not so much about the length of the transitional period as about its nature. In this respect the positions of NATO and Moscow are still a long way apart. "Today we exchanged general views on this problem, but now we need painstaking 'donkey work,'" Shevardnadze said. "I think that groups of experts could work on a permanent basis: This would make it possible to discuss a broader range of problems and ultimately speed up progress toward common ground."

Another complex of problems discussed in detail at the Munster talks was the prospects for economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and a united Germany. To a certain extent, this is a new feature: Until now, the political aspect has, as a rule, squeezed economic problems from the agenda of talks between the Soviet and West German ministers. According to E.A. Shevardnadze, this time economic problems were raised on Genscher's initiative. The FRG foreign minister set out

a detailed program for economic cooperation between the Soviet Union and the future Germany. "He looked into the future, as it were," Shevardnadze said, "and I singled out very many interesting proposals for myself. These primarily concern personnel training, investment in the development of certain sectors and regions of our country, scientific and technical cooperation, the joint solution of environmental problems, and exchange of experience in nuclear power station safety."

Recently the foreign press has often voiced the idea that the Shevardnadze-Genscher talks are discussing the amount of economic compensation to be paid to the Soviet Union in return for its consent to German unification and NATO membership for a united Germany. Commenting on these reports, E.A. Shevardnadze described them as groundless: "We are thinking about developing economic ties not only with Germany but also with America, France, and Britain. There is no question of any compensation."

In conclusion, there are a few more important points that we would like to highlight in the results of the Munster talks. First, addressing the news conference, Genscher said that this Thursday the FRG Bundestag will adopt a resolution on definitive recognition of Poland's western borders. The GDR People's Chamber will make a corresponding statement immediately after this. Second, during our conversation on board the aircraft, E.A. Shevardnadze confirmed that Genscher had given him guarantees that after German unification Article 23 of the FRG Constitution (which states that German lands may be incorporated into the Federal Republic without elections or a referendum) will be abolished. Third, the ministers have agreed to hold another meeting in the near future. This will most likely take place between the two sessions of "the Six"—on 22 June in Berlin and 18 July in Paris.

Alliances Examined Further

LD1906222690 Moscow World Service in English 1710 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The Soviet and West German foreign ministers have met in Munster, an old city in Federal Germany. [passage omitted] Flying back to Moscow Eduard Shevardnadze spoke in an interview with Radio Moscow's (?Aleksandr Gulikovskiy)

[Gulinkovskiy] Asked how he saw the solution of the key question of German unity's external aspects, namely a united Germany's political affiliation, the Soviet foreign minister said this was a question of talks. Very much will depend, he said, on how European structures will be formed.

It is very important, he said, that we and the Germans, both the Eastern and Western, have almost the same views on these future European structures. This speaks volumes. It is very important that we reach good understanding. This is true in the first place of relations between military and political alliances, or among the nations affiliated with them. Eduard Shevardnadze said the good understanding reached on this issue was the key gain of his latest discussion with Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

If the NATO countries that are to meet at summit level in London shortly make a fitting statement, and adopt a fitting and weighty declaration to jibe with the declaration that the Warsaw Treaty Organization adopted at its Moscow meeting, then they could make notable headway. Then the question of Germany's military and political status too could be considered in a new atmosphere and new conditions. This can have some interesting variants. In fact variants have already been outlined. President Gorbachev has made public several of them in parliament, and there can be some other possibilities, of course.

Of the variants this country put forward, Eduard Shevardnadze recalled the proposal for a united Germany to be neutral. We don't give up, he said, the double membership variant of preserving responsibility for a definite time, the transition period with Federal Germany responsible to NATO and the German Democratic Republic to the Warsaw Treaty Organization. The Soviet Union advanced some other variants—German withdrawal from NATO, for instance.

Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze concluded the interview by saying more proposals could be put forward if the situation permitted, and if, of course, this country's partners took into account both the concerns and interests of the Soviet Union and the problems and interests of its allies.

FRG Reportage on Visit

WA1906174190

For reportage on the visit by Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze to the Federal Republic of Germany, including reports on his talks with his counterpart Hans-Dietrich Genscher, please see the FRG section of the 18 June West Europe DAILY REPORT and subsequent issues.

Kohl Cited on NATO-Pact, Security Interests

PM2006085590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "H. Kohl: Taking Account of USSR Interests"]

[Text] Bonn, 15 Jul—FRG Chancellor H. Kohl has come out in favor of takirg the Soviet Union's security interests into account in resolving the question of Germany's membership of NATO.

In an interview with the weekly NEUE REVUE he stated that a united Germany can play an important role in building the West's relations with the new European democracies and the Soviet Union. At the same time, the

chancellor emphasized, it cannot vacillate between two systems and must remain a constituent part of the West.

The chancellor expressed the opinion that NATO membership for the whole of Germany can be acceptable for the Soviet Union as well, seeing that, in his words, peace and stability on the continent will thereby be strengthened. It goes without saying, H. Kohl said, that appropriate consideration must be given to the USSR's interests here. It is essential that the forthcoming summit sessions of the NATO Council and the European Council, as well as the meeting of the leaders of the leading capitalist states, be marked by substantial progress. The same goes in equal measure for the talks on the "two plus four" formula and the Vienna talks on conventional armed forces in Europe.

As yet it is still difficult to imagine in what form accords on the consideration of Soviet interests will be secured. It is not out of the question that corresponding treaties will be concluded between NATO and the Warsaw Pact, or even that joint declarations will be made on questions of security.

Antisubmarine Ships Conclude Visit to Italy

PM2006091390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Unidentified special correspondent report: "Farewell to Taranto"]

[Text] The official friendly visit to Italy of a detachment of Soviet warships comprising the large antisubmarine ship Ochakov and the guards large antisubmarine ship Krasnyy Krym is drawing to a close. Our sailors went on a Taranto city excursion and visited industrial enterprises. The Italians received one more opportunity to look over the Soviet ships.

The show group "Grafskaya Pristan" enjoys great success with the city inhabitants and gave two concerts in response to the numerous requests of its admirers.

The Soviet ships left the hospitable port of Taranto 15 June.

Yavoz Meets With Netherlands' Counterpart 18 Jun

LD1806153690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1446 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 18 Jun (TASS)—Netherlands Defense Minister Relus ter Beek arrived in Moscow today. The central point of the five-day itinerary of his stay in the Soviet Union is his talks with USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov and the signing of an agreement on preventing incidents at sea.

The head of the Netherlands defense department will speak to the teaching staff and students at the military academy of the USSR Armed Forces general staff, and will visit the "Taman" motorized infantry division and the "Yuriy Gagarin" cosmonauts training center. Relus ter Beek is to visit Leningrad and the shipbuilding yard, which will serve as an example so that he can see for himself the progress being made in the conversion of the Soviet military industry.

Territorial Agreement Signed

LD1906133990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1232 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)—Dmitriy Yazov, USSR defense minister, and Relus Ter Beek, his Netherlands colleague, who is here on an official visit, signed an agreement today on preventing incidents at sea outside territorial waters. It is aimed at guaranteeing the safety at sea of Soviet and Dutch warships, and the safety in flight of military aircraft in direct proximity to each other. The signing of this document, which the Netherlands minister described as "minor" [nebol'shoy], is another example of military detente. It became possible thanks to new thinking in international relations.

A TASS correspondent was told at the Soviet Military Department that appended to the agreement is a table of special signals which commanders of ships of each country will employ to warn of their intentions and possible maneuvers. Having signed this document the governments of the USSR and the Netherlands pledge that commanders of ships and aircraft will not, through their actions, create a threat to the other side.

Spanish Parliamentary Delegation Arrives 18 Jun

LD1806154590 Moscow TASS in English 1456 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 18 TASS—A delegation from the foreign affairs commission of the Spanish parliament arrived in Moscow today at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

"We have waited for this opportunity for a long time," the commission chairman, Luis Fajardo, told TASS. "The visit is important for us as evidence of the immense importance that we attach to parliamentary ties between our two states," he said.

The Spanish parliamentarians will meet with members of the international affairs committee of the Soviet parliament.

Their schedule envisages discussions at the Supreme Soviet economic reform committee and the Soviet Foreign Ministry, and a two-day trip to Leningrad.

Holds Talks on European Ties

LD1906081190 Moscow TASS in English 0802 GMT 19 Jun 90

[by TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Luis Fajardo, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Congress of Deputies of Spain's National Assembly (parliament) said the deputies have noted that the Soviet Union respects Germans' wish to exist as a united country.

A delegation of Spanish parliamentarians he heads arrived on Monday evening in Moscow at the invitation of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The problem of German unity was one of the main themes during the conversation of Spanish parliamentarians with members of the Committee for International Affairs of the USSR Supreme Soviet, Fajardo told TASS.

He noted that problems of a future European structure were discussed on a broader scale. The Spanish MP [member of parliament] noted the Soviet Union's invaluable contribution to the normalisation of international situation and safeguarding universal peace.

As regards Spanish-Soviet relations, Fajardo emphasised that there exist untapped reserves in economic, commercial and cultural cooperation. He said that the development of inter-parliamentary contacts enables the sides to get to know each other better.

The Spanish delegation intends to have conversations at the committee on the economic reform and at the Soviet Foreign Ministry. The parliamentarians will spend two days in Leningrad.

Meets With Zagladin

LD1906173490 Moscow TASS in English 1658 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—A Spanish delegation of the Foreign Affairs Commission of the Congress of Deputies of National Assembly (parliament) met Vadim Zagladin, adviser to the Soviet president, here today. They discussed the subject of the common European home. The Soviet spokesman described in detail the Soviet concept of the subject.

Speaking of Soviet-Spanish relations, Zagladin pointed out that Spain is regarded in the Soviet Union as a good and reliable political partner.

The importance of Soviet-Spanish parliamentary contacts and the development and strengthening of relations between the Soviet Union and Spain as a whole was the subject of a meeting with the delegation at the Soviet Parliament's Committee for International Affairs on Monday.

At the request of the guests, committee chairman Alexander Dzasokhov outlined Soviet approaches to the building of the common European home and German reunification, and answered questions concerning changes in East European countries, Soviet-American relations, and perestroyka in the Soviet Union.

"We take profound interest in the processes taking place in your country," delegation leader Luiz Fajardo, chairman of the commission, said during the meeting.

"What is taking place in Central and Eastern Europe is opening up a new future before all of us," he emphasised.

The idea of building an integrated Europe is supported in Spain, Fajardo said.

Swedish Pilots Demand Hijacker's Extradition

LD1906171290 Moscow TASS in English 1656 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Stockholm June 19 TASS—By TASS correspondent Taras Lariokhin:

The Swedish Pilots' Union will seek the extradition of Dmitriy Semenov, 17, who recently hijacked the Soviet Tu-154 passenger plane to Stockholm, to the Soviet authorities.

"No air pirate should remain in Sweden. People will be grateful to us, the Swedish pilots, for holding such a firm stance towards air piracy, which puts many human lives at stake," the union's vice-chairman Per Olssen said in an interview to the SWEDISH TELEGRAPH BUREAU (TT).

Embassy in Ankara Seeks Hijacked Plane's Return

LD1906110190 Moscow TASS in English 1042 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Istanbul June 19 TASS—The An-2 aircraft hijacked from Izmail Airport on Monday by a former pilot of the Odessa aircraft unit landed in Turkey on the same day.

The aircraft penetrated Turkish air space, flying at a low altitude over the Black Sea from Bulgaria. Local newspapers report that the hijacker was taken to a police station where he asked for political asylum in Turkey.

The Soviet Embassy in Ankara demanded the extradition of the hijacker and the aircraft. According to the GUMHURIYET newspaper, the demand will be discussed after studying the reasons for the hijack.

Supreme Soviet Session

Supreme Soviet Resolution on Transition to Market

PM1906103190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1,2

[USSR Supreme Soviet resolution "On the Concept for the Transition to a Regulated Market Economy in the USSR" dated Moscow, Kremlin, 13 June 1990]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet, having discussed the report by Comrade N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, "On the Country's Economic Position and the Concept for the Transition to a Regulated Market Economy" and attaching great significance to the consistent implementation of the economic reform resolves:

1. To consider the transition to market relations the main substance of the radical economic reform.

That the USSR Council of Ministers:

is to supplement and amend the concept for the transition to a regulated market economy which has been elaborated in line with the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies resolution with consideration for the recommendations made by the Supreme Soviets in the union and autonomous republics and the proposals made at the third USSR Supreme Soviet session;

is to submit by 1 September 1990 a program of interconnected measures—in terms of direction and dates—regarding the formation this year of the structure of and mechanism for a regulated market economy, including new approaches to finance-credit and pricing policy, proposals regarding changes in the system of USSR economic management organs, and forecasting of the socioeconomic consequences of the transition to market relations;

is to envisage a reduction in the budget deficit through a reduction in the amount of unfinished construction work, appropriations for defense, the upkeep of the state apparatus, and aid to foreign states, the sale of surplus material stocks, an increased economy drive in all sectors of the economy, and an increase in the effectiveness of foreign economic ties.

That materials submitted by the USSR Government, including alternative scenarios and the USSR Council of Ministers' conclusions with regard to them, are to be examined initially during September by USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' standing commissions with the help of leading scientists.

2. To recommend that Supreme Soviets in the union and autonomous republics and local soviets of people's deputies examine at sessions prior to 1 September 1990 the concept for the transition to a regulated market economy. It is recommended that they pay particular attention to discussing the proposals elaborated by the USSR Council of Ministers with regard to guarantees of social protection for the population, particularly impoverished strata, and also of citizens' savings and charitable funds in connection with the transition to a regulated market economy and price reform.

That the USSR Council of Ministers, along with USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' standing commissions, generalize the results of the discussion before 1 September 1990.

3. That the USSR Council of Ministers elaborate drafts of the requisite laws, with a view to guaranteeing the legal and economic conditions of the transition to a regulated market economy, and submit them when ready to the USSR Supreme Soviet in August-October 1990.

That the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium coordinate before 25 June with the supreme organs of state power in the union and autonomous republics the list of legislative acts that are to be elaborated and adopted at union and republic levels and a definite order of priority for them.

4. To instruct the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, the USSR Council of Ministers, the USSR Supreme Soviet committees, and the chambers' standing commissions to monitor the fulfillment of the decisions of the Second Congress of USSR People's Deputies and the laws on ownership, land, lease relations in the USSR, the fundamentals of economic relations between the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, local self-management and the local economy, the enterprise in the USSR, and other legislative acts linked with the implementation of economic reform that have been adopted and entered into force.

That the USSR Government report on the progress made in implementing the aforementioned laws be examined at the fourth USSR Supreme Soviet session.

5. With a view to urgently shaping the requisite conditions for the transition to a regulated market economy, that the USSR president be recommended to issue decrees or instruct the USSR Council of Ministers to adopt and enact, as of 1 July 1990, resolutions and provisional regulations regarding the implementation of the laws on ownership, land, the fundamentals of economic relations between the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, lease relations in the USSR, local self-management and the local economy, and above all the laws on the development of small enterprises, freedom of economic activity and enterprise, reducing state control over and decentralizing ownership, antimonopoly measures, joint-stock companies and other associations, work and deliveries for state needs, banking activity in the USSR, and economic and legal protection for public health, education, science and culture in the USSR.

6. That the USSR Council of Ministers be instructed to organize at all levels of economic management, starting with enterprises and organizations, the elaboration of economic and social development plans for 1991 in view

of the new legislative fundamentals of economic activity adopted and examined by the USSR Supreme Soviet, relations between the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, the formation of an all-union market, enhanced demands for the development of the social and cultural spheres and an improvement in the environmental situation, and proposals and comments from USSR people's deputies voiced at the third USSR Supreme Soviet session.

And submit drafts of the state plan for the country's economic and social development and the budget for 1991 to the USSR Supreme Soviet in October 1990.

That the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Commission] and the USSR Ministry of Finance are to submit for preliminary consideration by the relevant USSR Supreme Soviet committees and the chambers' standing commissions no later than 15 September 1990 material relating to the draft state plan for the country's economic and social development and the draft budget for 1991.

7. To deem it advisable in connection with the fundamental changes in the system of management and planning and the economy's transition to regulated market relations to elaborate the outlook for the economic and social development of the USSR at the same time as preparing the 1992 plan.

[Signed] A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

Supreme Soviet Session Ends in Controversy

PM1906151190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Morning Edition pp 1,3

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondents V. Dolganov and A. Stepova: "Price Rise Postponed. IZVESTIYA's Parliamentary Correspondents V. Dolganov and A. Stepova Report From Last Sitting of Third USSR Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] June 14 was a special day in our new parliament's history: The longest session of the country's supreme legislative organ in the entire Soviet period came to an end.

These months have featured many events. Our parliamentarians were unable to find answers to all the questions arising in our increasingly complex life. Not all of the numerous laws adopted by the Supreme Soviet were sufficiently "workable"—consequently, by the end of the third session there were persistent calls for the creation of a mechanism to monitor the execution of legislation.

The results of the session's work naturally require profound analysis. And, obviously, it is too soon to make any major generalizations or to draw any conclusions. So we will dwell on the last day of the session. In the morning A.I. Lukyanov in the chair called on deputies to work smoothly so as to complete the session the following day, 15 June. But, we imagine, the many months of fatigue coupled with the deputies' natural desire to get home as soon as possible were so strong that the work was finished that evening.

The people's deputies returned for the fifth time to the draft law on the taxation of enterprises, associations, and organizations. As you will probably recall, it was adopted a few days ago on its first reading, cutting the tax rate from the 55 percent proposed by the government to 45 percent. The version of the draft law amended after the first reading was submitted by Deputy A.N. Saunin. By tradition he reported which amendments had been adopted and which had not, and substantiated the working commission's opinion on each of the proposals submitted by the people's deputies. There were no particular disputes on many points.

Debate was only prompted by the discussion of the articles and provisions relating to preferential taxation. And you got the feeling that, however important the taxation law was, the deputies (along with any of us, incidentally) were far more interested and concerned about the second section of the chambers' joint plenary session—the resolution on the government proposals to raise the retail price of bread and bread products.

That morning the rumor started far beyond the Kremlin walls that the Council of Ministers had already reviewed its positions and remembered the decisions adopted by the country's Supreme Soviet—decisions in which the population was given the firm promise that there would be no price rises in the immediate future... No, the government was firm and consistent on the question of prices—probably more than it had been on anything else. Once again Yu.D. Maslyukov, chairman of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Committee], confidently announced: At your instructions I have held talks with all the republics. After which he read out the "unanimously agreed text," which stressed the fact that the executive is planning to resolve the question of price rises without the participation of the legislature.

So the deputies were unable to find out just who this "unanimity" referred to. The names of these historical heroes are still unknown. Incidentally, they are no longer so important for the work. Because, before one of the representatives of the executive and the political leadership spoke, the rostrum was taken by N.N. Gritsenko, chairman of the Commission for Questions of Labor, Prices, and Social Policy. He was no less firm than the government, but in the diametrically opposite direction.

On 31 October last year, he recalled, the Supreme Soviet adopted the law "On the State Budget for 1990" and on 20 November it adopted a resolution on additional measures to stabilize the consumer market and step up price control. Both documents categorically prohibited increases in the retail prices of everyday essentials—above all, bread, bakery products, oatmeal, and pulses—in 1990.

We cannot deceive the people and breach legal documents which we ourselves adopted, N.N. Gritsenko

stressed. And how in any case can we examine the question of prices without coordinating matters with union and autonomous republic legislatures? He proposed not the government draft but a draft "bread" resolution worked out by a group of people's deputies. It envisaged not abstract "consultation with republics" but the elaboration of the problem at the level of specific supreme soviets. Moreover, following this the country's parliament should examine the question of bread prices during the fall session.

Some amendments were proposed and were voted on, but in principle the result was clear-cut: The government proposal was rejected. And the deputies have no intention of losing control of this most complex problem, which is fraught with unpredictable social and political consequences. The resolution was adopted quite quickly.

Judging by everything, firmness was the dominant factor at our parliament's final sitting that day. Firmness was shown by Deputy L.I. Sukhov, who displayed for the umpteenth time his categoric rejection of market relations "on behalf of the working people." Admittedly, he decorated his speech—on the direct threat of an immediate popular explosion—with the appropriate props, taking the rostrum with a bundle containing, it later transpired, 10 pairs of men's socks and 15 pairs of tights.

My voters, Deputy L.I. Sukhov said, showing the parliament the bundle containing vital and scarce articles of clothing—sent me this package and asked me to share its contents out among the members of the Supreme Soviet. And he read out at the session the latest "letter from ordinary voters—the workers of industrial Kharkov." Apparently these socks and tights were to have been shared out among a collective of 120 people who proved "unwilling to accept this sop."

Our president, the deputy continued rather bombastically, said that meeting with people in America had broadened his view of that country. So isn't it time Mikhail Sergeyevich broadened his view of our people's life? This was followed by well-known complaints about sharing out everything equally, "preventing a return to capitalism," and so forth. "Bravo, capitalists!" Deputy L.I. Sukhov said. Foreign countries applaud while destroying us from within, destroying the country and the Army. He then pointedly handed the bundle of garments to the presidium.

We do not know about the world's capitalists—who are in no hurry to buy up what we for many years called first victorious and then developed socialism—but our parliament handclapped its colleague from start to finish of his fervent speech in defense of "imperishable values" and "ideals," by no means encouraging him to continue a show which offended the dignity of many deputies. Any civilized and self-respecting parliament would immediately have applied the severest sanctions for such a display. Incidentally, were there not grounds for recalling here the recently adopted law on the protection of the honor and dignity of the USSR president? After all, this was not a provincial rally...

A similar kind of clapping accompanied the speech delivered by the next speaker—Deputy A.N. Krayko—who made the following appeal: We have made a big mistake in not adopting the draft proposed by the government, because we have not allowed the government to demonstrate its integrity and enhance its prestige in the people's eyes. And the deputy's voice was altogether drowned in a storm of protest when he started defending the "good initiatives" of the now world-famous ANT state concern. After all, at the previous two sittings the session participants had rejected the attempt to change the name of one of the ministries and to conceal behind that concern obsolete bureaucratic ministerial structures discredited once and for all in society's eyes.

And as for the government's prestige... It too was mentioned a lot on the last day. Deputy Ye. Rakhmadiyev put it bluntly: Why does the government allow itself to forget about decisions made by the country's Supreme Soviet, thereby displaying patent disrespect for the lawmakers and attempting to saddle them with the adoption of unpopular (and ill-considered into the bargain) decisions?

Deputy S.M. Ryabchenko pointed out to the Council of Ministers representatives the patent contradictions in their declarations: In one case it is a question of compensating for the rise in the retail price of bread and bread products through increased wholesale prices for grain—an increase that has not been coordinated with the lawmakers. Later the deputies and the entire country repeatedly heard another version—that allegedly all the funds would go to compensate for the population's expenditure. So where is the truth? And when was the government being sincere? Detailed explanations and accounts should be made available by the fall session, S.M. Ryabchenko proposed.

This proposal was also supported by Deputy I.M. Bogdanov, who justified his viewpoint as follows: Comrade Maslyukov promises that money will be spent on developing and fundamentally improving things in the bread industry. But we've already heard plenty of these assurances, and we're not going to fall for any more of them. And, what is more, Deputy I.P. Zelinskiy cited precise economic figures to show that the average family would lose no less than 40 entirely uncompensated rubles from its budget if bread prices alone were raised. The government should be giving precise figures and rates rather than assurances.

The opinion of the government's activity given by Deputy A.L. Tsarevskiy was quite firm, if not severe. It was backed by an appeal to the parliament from the Miners' Congress: The planned programs will only exacerbate the crisis, the government is incapable of getting

the country out of that crisis, the situation is deteriorating with every passing day, and therefore the cabinet should immediately tender its resignation.

Another two deputies displayed firmness that day. Both were representing the Army section of the corps of deputies. But whereas S.F. Akhromeyev continued the attack begun several months ago on the magazine OGONEK and on "certain forces along with the mass media which are trying to destroy and discredit the Army," asking parliament to protect the Army from "mass anti-Army hysteria," V.N. Lopatin was firm about something else. We must talk about the causes that have given rise to the disastrous position of a huge number of servicemen. We must not hush up the Army's ills but implement radical and profound military reform—something which the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions is making every effort to hold up. The proposals made by the group of servicemen deputies on this reform have been shelved for six months now in this parliament.

On behalf of his many comrades Deputy B.I. Olcynik made an appeal to the top organs of state power in the union and autonomous republics. It called on them to pool their efforts to engage in constructive joint activity to set up an all-union, free, and equal market—the foundation on which the edifice of the new federation can be built.

Our parliament also swiftly dispatched a number of organizational measures connected with the reshuffling of existing formations and the creation of new ones.

A brief concluding speech summing up the session's results was delivered by A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The 30th legislative act to be adopted over these difficult months has been adopted today, he noted. Major groups of laws—economic laws, social laws, laws connected with interethnic relations, and laws strengthening the legal system—have been elaborated. There have, of course, been shortcomings in this work too, particularly with regard to monitoring the execution of adopted decisions. Even more complex work lies ahead. There are already around 30 bills awaiting the fourth session, which is provisionally scheduled to open 3 September (and committees and commissions should reassemble as of 20 August).

Thanking the deputies for their work, A.I. Lukyanov declared the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet closed.

So the recess is upon us.

15 Jun Presidium Meeting Viewed

PM2006102990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium Sitting"]

[Text] A USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium sitting was held in the Kremlin 15 June chaired by A.I. Lukyanov.

Summing up the results of the work of the third session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, the Presidium pointed out that highly topical problems relating to the country's development, the practical implementation of political, economic, and legal reforms, interethnic relations, and foreign policy all came within the USSR Supreme Soviet's purview. In this time more than 50 major questions of state life had been considered, affecting the interests, effectively, of all population groups.

It has proved possible to carry out a considerable legislative program within a comparatively short period. Some 33 important laws have been adopted, including packages of legislative acts linked with deepening political and economic reform, strengthening the union republics' sovereign rights and the powers of autonomous formations, and with the free development of nations and ethnic groups within the framework of the Soviet federative state.

The Presidium approved proposals regarding the dates for the convocation of the fourth USSR Supreme Soviet session. A tentative list of draft USSR legislative acts and other questions to be prepared for upcoming Supreme Soviet sessions, along with directions for the development of the USSR Supreme Soviet's international ties next year, were examined and mainly approved.

The question of carrying out the USSR Supreme Soviet's instructions regarding the elaboration of legislation concerning the transition to a regulated market economy was also discussed. It was recommended that the Supreme Soviet Presidiums in the union and autonomous republics submit lists of legislative acts on this question.

A commission was set up to prepare the draft new fundamentals of civil legislation in the USSR and the union republics.

The Presidium sitting also examined certain other questions associated with the work of the Supreme Soviet and its organs.

Conference Airs USSR Germans' Concerns

PM1906132790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Problems of Soviet Germans Discussed"]

[Text] A conference has been held at the Soviet of Nationalities Commission on Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations to examine the progress in fulfilling the USSR Supreme Soviet resolutions on the problems of the Soviet Germans.

USSR people's deputies, senior officials from union and republic departments, and representatives of the Soviet Germans took part in it. It discussed the abolition of acts

of legislation used as the basis for repression against the peoples, on the status of participants in the "labor army," and on the formation of German national rayons and rural soviets in areas densely populated by Soviet Germans to take account of their wishes and the specific situation.

Particular attention was devoted to an analysis of the steps to create the conditions to meet the ethnic and cultural requirements of the German population.

The idea to hold a congress of representatives of the Soviet Germans and to set up an extraterritorial association which would be concerned about representing and protecting the interests of this nationality's interests was supported.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Warns He Might Lose Position Soon

AU2006091690 Paris AFP in English 0900 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, June 20 (AFP)—Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev raised the possibility that he might soon no longer be head of the Soviet Communist Party, during a brief and ill-humoured address to the congress of Russian communists on Wednesday.

He spoke to the congress for a few minutes after another speaker had suggested that an appeal be made to him as Soviet Communist Party secretary general to maintain party oganisations within the KGB secret police and the Army.

Several speakers at the congress have addressed themselves directly to Mr. Gorbachev.

Clearly irritated, he took the microphone to say: "Comrades address themselves very easily to the secretary general, to the president of the country...That point does not concern me. Perhaps tomorrow already, or in 10 days, or in 12 days, there will be another secretary general, or president of the party."

Earlier the Russian Communists voted to turn their conference into the "founding congress" of a revived Russian Communist Party, 65 years after the original one was dissolved by Stalin.

The motion setting up the congress was approved by 2,316 votes to 171, with 38 abstentions.

Prison Riots Seen at Chelyabinsk, Dnepropetrovsk

Details Viewed

LD1906195490 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 19 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] The Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs has sent us the following: As already reported, on 17 June, at Remand Center [sledstvenyy izolyator] No. 1 of the Chelyabinsk Oblast Executive Committee, widespread disturbances took place, during which the medical supply unit and catering block of the center were devastated. As a result of the professional and competent actions of a combined detachment of internal affairs troops and members of the militia, the situation has been fully normalized, and the inmates returned to their cells. During the disturbances, in attempting to escape, one inmate was killed and two injured. An inquiry is under way.

And here is another report, this one from Dnepropetrovsk—you have also heard about it, either on television or read it in the papers: On the night of 13-14 June, at Remand Center No. 1 of the Internal Affairs Directorate of the Dnepropetrovsk Oblast Executive Committee, inmates and persons on remand seized hostages and occupied a number of service quarters. By the middle of the night they had broken out of an area between blocks and captured the greater part of the premises of the remand center. They presented to the administration demands consisting of 21 points. These included complaints about the rudeness and brutality of the personnel, the unsanitary conditions, the poor food, and the tedium of the cells, each of which accommodates 20-30 people. At the start of the conflict there were about 2,500 people at the center, including women and adolescents. Several buildings were set afire and damaged; as you can see, cars and other equipment, too, and food warehouses were ransacked.

As a result of six days of talks, an end to the widespread disturbances was finally achieved. An inquiry is under way. Early reports put the damage caused by the disturbances at about R3,000,000. Wholesale repairs and restoration work have already begun at the sites and buildings of the remand center. As Comrade Gladush, Ukrainian minister of internal affairs, who arrived at the site, reported, the incident could have been avoided if all legal questions concerning the individuals in custody had been settled earlier. The current procedures ran counter to the processes of perestroyka. [video shows disturbances at Dnepropetrovsk remand center with wreckage of buildings evident and inmates walking around]

Troops Stabilize Unrest

LD1906192990 Moscow TASS in English 1901 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The situation at a pretrial prison of Chelyabinsk, Urals, has normalised. The inmates have returned to cells and Interior Ministry troops to the barracks, a spokesman for the Soviet Interior Ministry announced here today.

On June 17, nine inmates of the Chelyabinsk jail attacked five guards, took the cell keys and released the prisoners.

About 1,000 prisoners thronged into the yard and tried to escape by ramming the gate with an automatic loader.

Interior Ministry troops and special police units were sent to qell the disturbances.

The situation at a similar institution in Dnepropetrovsk, the Ukraine, has also returned to normal.

Its inmates went on the rampage on June 13, setting fire to the premises and taking eight guards as hostages.

Two prisoners attempted an escape. One of them was wounded and the other killed in the attempt.

Reportage on Run-up to 28th CPSU Congress

Roundtable Discusses Prospects

PM1906141990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Second Edition pp 1, 3

[Report by N. Kozhanov, I. Podsvirov, and Yu. Shabanov under the rubric "Precongress Meetings at PRAVDA Editorial Office": "Will the Party Be a Vanguard Force?"]

[Text] As already reported, a meeting with 28th CPSU Congress delegates has taken place at the PRAVDA editorial office. Ways to restructure and democratize the party and to enhance the prestige of communists were discussed. Participating in the discussion were V. Avgus, scientific associate of the "Rotor" Science and Production Association; A. Volkov, secretary of the party committee of the "Plastik" Science and Production Association; Yu. Voronov, first secretary of Leninskiy CPSU Raykom [Rayon Committee] (Ivanovo City); A. Dadykin, director of Tomilino Production Association (Moscow Oblast); V. Drovennikov, senior lecturer at the All-Union Correspondence Institute of the Food Industry; S. Zaytsev, senior lecturer at the Moscow Automotive Institute; L. Medvedeva, first secretary of Sovetskiy CPSU Raykom (Moscow City); I. Ryabov, gear cutter at the "Poligrafmash" Association (Leningrad City); and V. Chikin, secretary of the party committee of Minsk Clock and Watch Plant. Also participating in the discussion were A. Ilin, deputy chief editor of PRAVDA and editor of the Party Life Department; and V. Poshatayev, member of the editorial board and editor of the Ideological Department.

The discussion was chaired by I. Frolov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chief editor of PRAVDA.

Platform on the Left, Platform on the Right

I. Frolov: I am pleased to welcome 28th congress delegates to the PRAVDA editorial office. You know that we are preparing for the congress and that our "Discussion Pamphlet" is entirely devoted to the precongress discussion. As you can see, we publish letters and articles of very diverse substance, frequently with opposite views. We have published a number of alternative platforms in addition to the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform. The "roundtable" meetings at the editorial office which we are inaugurating with today's discussion also serve the same aim.

Let us try during our discussion to answer a number of questions of concern to communists today and, above all, the central question—"What are we going to bring to the congress?"—which embraces a mass of urgent problems.

Take, for example, the party's perestroyka itself, its renewal. How do you congress delegates picture this process? Or take the new procedure for electing congress delegates. What changes are there here? What do you think has prevented many communists among the workers and peasants from becoming congress delegates?

I would particularly like to hear your view of the upcoming Russian Party Conference, which might be transformed into a Congress of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party.

Further. How do you understand the slogan about the power of the party masses? Is it possible to preserve the principle of democratic centralism in the new statutes? As you know, the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform and the Democratic and Marxist Platforms make different replies to this question.

A question of considerable importance: How to ensure the party's unity under conditions of pluralism of opinions and the formation of various platforms and associations of communists? Are factions in the party permissible? This too is a topic for discussion and is assessed differently in different platforms. The party and the soviets. What should their relations be? The forms and methods of party influence on the activities of communist deputies in organs of people's power and in other organizations.

Another fundamental question could also be proposed: the party and the economy. What will party organizations in the production unit do under the new conditions? Will the territorial-production principle of building the party be maintained under conditions of a multiparty system?...

And, finally, a question that is becoming increasingly urgent: the CPSU and other political parties, possible forms of their cooperation. The matter is not clear, and debate is frequently conducted very aggressively, particularly in relation to the CPSU. But it seems to me that there is a definite failure even on the part of certain communists to understand how much the situation in the party has changed, when a multiparty system has already been designated in our society constitutionally, as it were. How all this will affect the party, how it will function under these conditions, precisely which of its functions come to the fore—these are the problems that we must resolve right now. The party will increasingly become an ideological-political force. But for this we must more resolutely counter the "enemy image" that is

being created by certain forces in the shape of the party, which, they say, deserves nothing more than universal repentance and self-disbandment. How are we to overcome these syndromes being imposed on us?

V. Drovennikov: The audiences we address often set before us a huge number of questions and demand immediate answers to them. But in a number of cases, generally speaking, the answer does not yet exist. Events are developing so rapidly now that even the assessments that we made yesterday sometimes become obsolete and demand a different approach.

You know, I am going to this congress in great alarm. I sense the immensity of the tasks entrusted to it, but there are also doubts about its ability to resolve them.

I will begin with the fact that we are approaching the congress essentially without having its documents in the necessary state of readiness. And no time at all is left. In my opinion the congress election procedure, which in advance placed the candidates in unequal starting conditions, has proved very, very undemocratic. And this is by no means a mere detail: The composition of the delegates, which to a considerable degree is apparatus-based, will inevitably introduce a large dose of inertia, stereotypes, and traditional thinking into the congress.

I am afraid that a situation might arise in which the congress will turn "to the right," which will inevitably provoke a countermovement by democratic forces—supporters of the Democratic Platform, above all—and push the party toward a split, which cannot be permitted.

And again. The congress will need professionals, at least a small group of experienced political experts. Because we now have to work at such a level and with such problems that amateurism is simply no longer enough. We are all great masters at discussing various "organizational questions," but the crux of the problems...

A. Ilin: I wish to put in a small retort. I know that the Democratic Platform, for example, has already prepared corresponding proposals with regard to what kind of announcements and declarations can be posted up. This runs the risk that procedural questions may take up a very great deal of time, as at the Congresses of People's Deputies, require a lot of effort, and be a distraction from the chief point. And there will be 5,000 people at the congress. Under such conditions it will be very difficult to extricate ourselves from organizational questions of various kinds.

I. Ryabov: About the elections of workers to the congress. I may have won by chance. Ours is a very large, plant party organization and, moreover, my district also included the plant where I began working. I still have many old friends there. Although the struggle was in earnest. There were nine of us candidates: five "Democrats" and we four on the CPSU Platform. We seem, somehow, to have a lot of platforms. Just look: platform to the left, platform to the right, and the locomotive is flying off the rails...

But another question wounded me more than anything. Some 47 percent of people did not vote at all. And not just in my district. You come to meet with communists, and there are just us, the nine candidates, and the audience of six or 12 people. This is what shook me—the passivity of communists. I know the workers' sentiments. Many are leaving the party because they have stopped believing in our ideas, the ideas of socialism. And yet people frequently leave who have been and still are personalities. The party needs them. What is to be done?

A. Dadykin: I myself used to be a worker. I was a lathe operator, fitter, and foreman, then senior foreman. I was elected director from multiple candidates. I have been a party member for 20 years. So I think I know life. The whole point is, I think, that people are fed up with living in poverty, they want there to be something on the shelves. A time has come when economics cannot be counterposed to ideology.

Yes, I am in favor of a vanguard party of workers and peasants—a leading [vedushchaya] force in both ideology and politics. And also without fail in the economy. Even if just 7 or even 5 million members remain in the party, it will be a real party, and a party, like a revolution, must be able to defend itself. And of course, only a party that expresses the people's will and interests deserves attention and prestige.

Today the opposition is in an advantageous position. It is, so to speak, the strategist who can see the battle from the sidelines. And many people heed its words. So we should organize work in such a way that the words that ring out are not from our opponents but from us communists ourselves. Words about how we can lead better lives.

People say: Voters have no instructions for congress delegates. There are instructions, the instructions are about one thing, ensuring that the state is strong and powerful and that people live well. That is what ideology is all about today, in my view. For workers, for kolkhoz members, and for the intelligentsia.

A few words about the nationalities question. It has not been raised here. We were forever saying: The nationalities question has been resolved in our country. Now see what has happened. And, if you think about it, the underlying reason is just the same—people are talking about independence, but what lies behind this is just one concern, just one hope: They think that, once they are on their own, they will have a better life. See how the issues are interwoven—political, economic, ideological, and organizational issues. And all this will emerge at the congress. And we must emerge from it united.

V. Avgus: Yesterday one of the secretaries of the primary party organization at the Institute for Aviation Engine Building named for Baranov spoke to me. The enterprise is in the district that elected me to the congress. And he showed me a decision of their department's party meeting which I think reflects certain views that are

today typical of our technical intelligentsia. For instance, the department's communists criticize the draft Central Committee Platform because, instead of admitting the CPSU's responsibility for the crisis in society and for the tremendous casualties sustained during the party's totalitarian rule, out of inertia it makes claims to a continued vanguard role.

There is also criticism of the reaffirmation of the production principle in the party's structure and the retention of party organizations in production and other collectives, army political organs, the KGB, and the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. The draft is condemned for the halfheartedness and inconsistency of its economic program. There is support for the proposals to leave at least 50 percent of party dues at the disposal of primary organizations and to reduce dues to one percent of earnings...

As for the elections for the congress according to the new formula, it is amply clear that neither rayon party organizations nor city organizations proved prepared to conduct them in a calm and sensible fashion. From my own Kalininskiy Rayon I can say that, out of our nine delegates, two party raykom secretaries were elected for districts composed of a large number of small primary organizations. Everything apparently looks very democratic, but when party districts are appropriately organized, the results are clear—not many workers and a great many party secretaries...

A. Ilin: But so far as I am aware, it is Democratic Platform supporters who claim the credit for putting forward the idea of elections on the basis of party districts. Now that such elections have been held, that same Democratic Platform is criticizing them. Incidentally, we too criticize them, it is not for nothing that we have raised that question at today's meeting. But you read out a decision. It contains a mass of things that the Democratic Platform has been repeating day in, day out, month in, month out. About the 50 percent of the dues, leaving them at the disposal of primary organizations. That is contained even in the draft statutes. But we are again raising this question. And a number of other questions essentially amount to recording steps that both the Central Committee and other associations of communists have already taken.

We say we must emerge from the congress united. But some people's constant, importunate underlining of their own special nature, their own position, may indeed have the result that the congress may split over less than fundamental, secondary issues and the proceedings may become a free-for-all. And instead of answering the questions to which the people are expecting an answer, the congress will discuss who was the first to say "a," who was the first to say "b," and so forth. So just you think: What should we do to ensure that, despite everything, the congress does not split up on the basis of various platforms and, so to speak, does not head off in divergent directions but answers the main questions facing the party today?

A Split: Pros and Cons

V. Avgus: About the question of a split. In my view, today this word sounds just like "private ownership" or "multiparty system" sounded a little while ago. I do not share the view that a split is all that terrible. In my opinion, the development of general democratic processes in the country is objective in nature. We should not stage competitions between platforms. We should not set some against others as the poor used to be set against the rich and as those who work well and those who work badly are today being turned against one another. The charge of freeloading has now begun to be leveled against people. But who was it that accustomed them to this freeloading? Was it not we who used to say: We are leading you in the right direction, we know everything, a bright future lies ahead... Today, in my view, the central question is the method that the congress will choose in order to dismantle the state party that the CPSU used to be and has ceased to be since the introduction of changes to Articles 6 and 7 of the Constitution. It is very difficult, in my view, to choose the method of dismantlement. One constructive way that may be proposed is that the congress should be held in two stages. So that the party masses can really decide the party's fate, a referendum should be held between the stages. And at the second stage of the congress we should decide in a completely democratic spirit: Anyone who wants to form a Democratic Platform please go ahead, anyone who wants to espouse the Central Committee's positions please go ahead. And I think that such a decision would promote consolidation in society.

And another point. I am troubled that today criticism is directed mostly toward central party organs. It is the Central Committee Secretariat and the Politburo that are condemned. This is clearly apparent even in the position of the Moscow city party organization. As though all the gorkoms [city committees], obkoms [oblast committees], and raykoms had nothing to do with it. You get the following impression: People are demanding personal accountability reports from members of the Politburo and Secretariat, are voting that their work be deemed unsatisfactory, and at rallies are demanding resignations. And the upshot is that, in going along with this slogan—down with the leading central organ—the party obkoms, gorkoms, and raykoms are essentially trying to ride to the top in place of the people who are going to be dismissed. While ducking any responsibility for what is happening.

A. Dadykin: At the oblast party conference we discussed the report of V. Mesyats, first secretary of Moscow party obkom. Seventeen people spoke. V. Mesyats was sharply criticized in 15 speeches...

Rejoinder: That's exactly why they did not let him resign before the conference, though he was insistently asking to...

A. Dadykin: In fact I want to continue Vasiliy Petrovich Avgus' thought and take issue with him in some respects.

I do not know about other city and oblast conferences, but before criticizing the Politburo and the Central Committee, we looked at ourselves. There were many reproaches about practically all secretaries of the obkom and of oblast and rayon party organizations. Indeed, it is not very honest to "lump the blame" for everything on the center while yourself hiding in the bushes to avoid responsibility for past and present transgressions. Although in principle the party's central organs also deserve serious criticism.

V. Poshatayev: In my view, criticism should be personal, you should not say, as many people are now saying: Let the party admit it is to blame for the whole of the last 70-plus years. Is it at all possible to accuse the party as a whole without differentiating between the activity of different generations of communists or taking into account the fierce internal party battles? After all, both Stalin and Brezhnev had opponents in the party. Among communists there were many who embarked on an ideological struggle against these leaders. And they ended up in camps and psychiatric hospitals, they were ranked as "dissidents," and they had to leave the motherland.

Of course, there is also such a thing as collective guilt. Not everyone had the firmness and boldness to fight. But surely the self-critical admission of past errors and crimes and the very fact that the party initiated perestroyka constitute an admission of this guilt?

I. Ryabov: It is fashionable nowadays to shout: "Repent if you are a communist." But I will not. I have nothing to repent. Or tell me what the communists who were repressed in the past are supposed to repent of, as has been rightly remarked here? It was communists who suffered the most terrible blow.

V. Chikin: I would like to return to the theme of the body of delegates. It is said that that there are not enough workers in it and too many party organization secretaries. This is regarded as the result of behind-the-scenes games by the apparatus. I don't think people should be so unequivocal in their judgments. I, the party committee secretary, had five rivals at our plant and I had six in the district. Half of them were workers. And I won with a margin of just five votes. If you consider things more deeply, the composition of the delegates reflects above all the fact that the party is losing its prestige among the working class. And we should think hard about this and grasp the reasons for it.

Ivan Timofeyevich Frolov has asked here: What are we bringing to the congress? Personally, I am bringing anxiety over the party's fate along with pretty sizable doubts as to whether the congress will succeed in extricating the party from the crisis. At any rate, losses are inevitable. I think that the political margins—both on the right wing and on the left—will break away from the party.

The question now is: How and on what basis is the remaining section of party members to be consolidated? Clearly, on the basis of precise ideas for emerging from the crisis formulated in the guise of a program document. Not counting minor ones, we now have three main programs-cum-platforms—the CPSU Central Committee Platform, the Marxist Platform, and the Democratic Platform. If the latter were to win—I am judging by the debate in our plant party organization—there would be an instant deep split in the party because many people do not want to adopt social democratic garb. If the CPSU Central Committee Platform is adopted—in the form in which the draft was published—I am sure that a lingering demise and death lies in store for the party, because people are generally indifferent to it. The Marxist Platform too is by no means the best option, I believe...

I. Frolov: Forgive me for interrupting. The following proposal is now being made (I am a supporter of it, incidentally): that work on the platform not be deemed completed before the congress but be continued at the congress, as work on a new party program. And in a couple of years we can convene a party conference and adopt it...

V. Chikin: You took the words right out of my mouth. That is what I thought too. First we should clearly determine where we are heading—toward a socialist future or in some other direction. Obviously, such a future will seem unacceptable to some people. Then, at the second stage, after a demarcation of positions, we should decide what the party and its program should be like.

There are many complaints about science here. In contemporary terms, what do a socialist future and a communist future mean? Science is not providing a clear answer, but it is very important for people to understand this. Incidentally, we in the Minsk communists' club have elaborated a document called the Manifesto of a Communist Party That Is Undergoing Renewal. It has been published in the republican press. In this document, which was drawn up with the participation of well known social scientists, we attempted to provide answers to these questions. I am not claiming they are correct, but at least we have tried to explain to people where we are heading...

Yu. Voronov: Maybe we should explain not only where we are heading but also who is leading us. Of course, even now there is a substantial bureaucratic stratum in the party which is stubbornly clinging to its posts. But note that many people from primary organizations, "from below," so to speak, have entered leading party organs, especially the middle level. These are vigorous, principled people. Thanks to them we have begun to build up plenty of political muscle. I think the party as a whole can rely on them. And surely the fact that major labor collectives nominate party workers, raykom secretaries, for instance, as candidates for conference delegates indicates trust? Don't think I'm being immodest, but I too was nominated as a candidate by a labor collective. I think that more workers should also have

been nominated. But what am I supposed to do in that situation if people have nominated me—wag my tail and go skulking off into the bushes? Am I to abandon the struggle? I would be worthless as a party worker and communist in that case.

As for what I am bringing to the congress, I reply: the hope that, despite everything, the party will not split. And for this it is necessary to formulate a program that really reflects the people's aspirations: I would call it a Program of National Consensus. A program the people would believe in. Otherwise nothing will work out. You can't formulate a program off the cuff, so I too support the idea of holding the congress in two stages. And the program should be adopted only after prior consultation with all communists. For instance, through a referendum. But I think two years simply in order to elaborate a program is too long. The political situation in the country is now changing very fast. We may completely miss the bus, and then the program will be pointless...

B. Drovennikov: I agree with the comrades who say that it is not our internal party problems that will decide the fate of the congress and the party. That will be decided by the party's position on socioeconomic problems.

People will judge us not according to whether or not we renounce democratic centralism, but according to how attractive the party's socioeconomic policy is. But we have often begun to retire into our shell, to look no further than our own internal problems and ambitions.

Yu. Voronov: True. And here we should view communists as individuals, as party fighters. In our rayon we carried out a sociological poll. The results were depressing. For instance, only seven percent of 1,000 nonparty people said that the communists working alongside them could provide an intelligible explanation of party policy. How many passive communists do we have? Yet people judge the party as a whole on the basis of them. And they assail it from all sides...

Rejoinder: Passiveness is not the only problem. Just take a look, the shelves in the stores are empty...

L. Medvedeva: Three years ago I was elected raykom secretary, then six months ago I was elected first secretary. For 15 years before that I taught in school. I was elected a delegate in a contested election. And I became a Moscow City Soviet deputy only after a difficult struggle. Believe me, it was very difficult for a first secretary to fight for a deputy's mandate.

Just now I heard a rejoinder about empty shelves. And, of course, about the party's responsibility. They are empty, it is true. But let us talk for a minute about the functions of the party and the soviets, about power in general. The party has handed over power to the soviets and no longer lays claim to a monopoly of power. So how are we to influence the policy of the city, the republic, the country? Through communist deputies, we are told. Formally speaking, they have a majority in the soviets, in our Moscow Soviet, for instance. However, they are divided into blocs and are by no means of the same opinion. There are 92 who support the policy of the party gorkom. A minority. But questions are always decided by a simple vote, that is, by the majority. Whatever the "Democratic Russia" bloc supports gets through...

No, I am not trying to blame the soviets for the empty shelves in stores. They were not full even before. But if we have our own position, our own solution as to how to fill them, this solution has a hard time getting through the soviet. Hence, to some extent, the passiveness. We have never before worked in a bloc system, as the minority or, to be more precise, in opposition. We must learn this. Learn to pursue our line, to formulate a policy that attracts people by its specific results rather than by "radiant" prospects.

Take, for instance, the switch to a market economy, as mentioned by the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. As you yourselves know, attitudes toward the concept that has been submitted are mixed. Our government consists largely of communists. Therefore its policy is the party's policy. But the party proclaims the power of the party masses. So those masses ought to have been asked in advance what kind of policy they want. Then it would have been possible to pursue the party line more clearly...

Is Commerce Permissible

I. Frolov: The question of the mass media is assuming exceptional importance at the present stage, in conditions of a multiparty system. As you know, the Law on the Press was adopted at the USSR Supreme Soviet session. But in itself the law will not work unless journalists and party committees seek new forms in propaganda and agitation. What is PRAVDA doing to this end, for instance? We have already embarked on a radical reorganization of the paper connected with creating an association that would also include a special editorial office for a regular television program [programma]. In our view, the resolution of this question will match up to contemporary demands. When I was in the United States, Japan, and other countries I saw for myself yet again that a present-day civilized society simply cannot exist without such news associations, which, besides everything else, yield substantial revenue for their founders. This work has long since been placed on a broad commercial footing abroad.

The question of dividing up property and the mass news media is increasingly often raised nowadays. So we are thinking about a publishing house under PRAVDA which would publish books, popular magazines, and maybe its own youth newspaper and advertising supplement. Any newspaper is supported not so much on the basis of its print run as on the basis of well organized advertising. It is not impossible that we will have something like a joint-stock company in the future.

Thus we hope that right after the congress the party will receive quite a reliable information system that quite legally yields money in order to strengthen the material

base. What other parties do to resolve this problem, if they emerge, is their concern.

V. Chikin: Our plant published its own newspaper and regularly published party committee and trade union committee bulletins. However, lately the "opposition" has become to be so active in our city that the plant newspaper, which endeavors to tell the truth and to firmly uphold the party cause, now enjoys great popularity among readers. Its print run has now increased to 30,000 and it is bringing in income. We have concluded a contract and are now distributing the paper throughout the city. Recently I addressed communists at a party conference and I gave my word: We will not take another kopek from party membership dues to pay for the party committee apparatus. On the contrary, we will strengthen the party budget thanks to publication of the newspaper. That is, the apparatus will be entirely maintained by revenue from the plant newspaper.

Rejoinder: That is very interesting and valuable experience. The newspaper business is a profitable one throughout the world. But in our country almost any plant newspaper makes a loss. But it turns out that it can be made profitable and can be placed in the service of the party budget.

V. Chikin: Precisely. We used to be constantly criticized over the 12,000-ruble loss made by the old plant newspaper. People used to say: Just what are you doing, comrade communists? After all, this money is earned by all the members of the labor collective, not just the party members. But now this talk has ceased. Moreover, we have been able to double our journalists' wages compared to the "opposition" newspaper. On top of that we pay a royalty.

I. Frolov: PRAVDA's staffers are in a far more difficult position than you. Essentially we are still deprived of any possibility of independently resolving our internal financial problems. Unfortunately, material questions relating to PRAVDA's activity are still resolved in the CPSU Central Committee Administration of Affairs. And by people who often have a poor idea of what a journalist's work, newspaper production, and so forth are like.

I regard it as one of the main shortcomings of perestroyka that the good decisions of the Central Committee January 1987 Plenum on cadre renewal in the party were not properly implemented. If there had actually been radical cadre renewal, we would have a very different party and we probably would not be in such a state of crisis.

Question: Ivan Timofeyevich, what is your view on the idea of the PRAVDA editorial collegium and its chief editor being ratified at the CPSU congress and being accountable only to it?

I. Frolov: There is scarcely any point in doing that for the editorial collegium, since the congress delegates will not know all its members. Moreover, the chief editor would be deprived of the opportunity to pick his own "team." In my view, the congress can ratify the chief editor, but as for the rest, that is within our competence.

A. Dadykin: Vyacheslav Andreyevich Drovennikov said here that, despite the fact that a commission to prepare the 28th CPSU Congress documents has been set up in the Central Committee and is already working actively, there are still no finished documents. When will they emerge? However, we cannot be satisfied with the old cliches and old slogans that have been the practice in our party. Like the following, for instance: "Provide housing by the year 2000." What can that do? It is not thought through, the construction industry is not ready. And there are a great many other similar slogans that are amorphous and have not been borne out by life. I think that in the absence of comprehensively verified documents the congress will certainly be dragged out. On the one hand, a fierce polemic will develop between the supporters of different platforms and, on the other, will we be able in such an atmosphere to formulate a common economic and political strategy and to resolve specific questions of agriculture, machine building, the defense complex, and construction?

Rejoinder: Why should the central government, which mostly represents our party and elaborates economic strategy, not consult with the congress? After all, the responsibility for making sure that the plans are not messed up, heaven forbid, once again will fall not personally on Gorbachev, Abalkin, and Ryzhkov but on the whole party, on communists. But no one asks us about anything, no one consults properly with us. We pay lipservice to the power of the party masses, but in reality we are once again waiting for apparatus decisions, which apparently, judging by V. Ivashko's statements, even the leaders of union republic communist parties are the last to learn of.

A. Volkov: The question that was the first to be asked today is very important. Indeed, what do we expect of the congress? Without offering an answer about the essence of the matter, people are already talking about holding it in two stages. But we are too late in doing this. Why? I will try to explain my view. Point one. The people still view us as congress delegates capable of doing something. But if we indefinitely postpone the resolution of the most important tasks, this means that we will be like the Congresses of People's Deputies—both all-union and Russian—which are being seriously criticized.

It seems to me that we have to consolidate healthy forces by adopting all the best elements from all the platforms. And then the need to hold a second stage will vanish.

Here is the second argument in favor of this. It is no secret that in 1903, at our party's second congress, the party's program was published for discussion, if memory serves, 14 months in advance. The same thing happened with the party statutes—10 months in advance. But just three-four months have been allocated to us for discussion of these documents. Is this a lot or a little? A little, of course. If we want to remain a party of the vanguard

type and to continue to lead the masses, we ought to have consulted with communists considerably sooner.

I. Frolov: The draft new CPSU Statutes also presuppose holding party conferences in the intervals between congresses. And two or even three conferences can be held. The status of the conference is also changing. I remember there were great debates in the Central Committee about this back before the 19th All-Union Party Conference. Should we make changes so that the conference could reelect, could remove and install Central Committee members, for instance? At that time we decided to act in accordance with the statutes. But the statutes say nothing about the conference's powers. Now it is currently proposed that our conference will reelect 25 percent of the Central Committee. I believe that this is a sensible proposal. Indeed, it is an impermissible luxury to wait five years, as before, in order to renew cadres at a scheduled party congress.

S. Zaytsev: In my view, we (I mean congress delegates) must not forget that great hopes are being pinned on us by ordinary communists who are concerned and, I will be blunt, alarmed by negative processes in the course of perestroyka. The main concern is over the situation in the party and the position of the party itself within society. There is now a very great deal of talk about what constitutes socialism and what communism. People have begun to apply appropriate epithets: democratic, humane. PRAVDA, MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, and other papers have written numerous times about this. As a result socialism has remained humane and democratic. But excuse me. People rightly say: Can socialism be inhumane or undemocratic? We must firmly define our position here.

As we have seen for ourselves, many questions are arising over organizational problems of forming and preparing the 28th CPSU Congress and the Russian conference. MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA published an appeal by congress delegates to the Leningrad Communists, to those who convened the second initiative congress for a Russian Communist Party. But if you consider matters, this is a response to the inaction of the Central Committee Russian Bureau and maybe the Politburo too! Although the question of forming a Communist Party—if not a Russian Communist Party, then an RSFSR Communist Party—is among the most serious and urgent questions of the present crucial stage. There are just a few days to go before the conference, yet we have absolutely no documents to hand. We will be taking part in the proceedings without knowing the real situation.

Another point. Here Vasiliy Petrovich has presented to us a few points about a party of the parliamentary type, which involves abandoning the production principle and the principle of democratic centralism. There are about 500 communists in our organization. They have different viewpoints, but nevertheless the majority of them advocate a party of the vanguard type, advocate working in the production unit, at enterprises, working in organizations, with nonparty people and communists. We are against factions in the party. In a multiparty system if you don't like the Communist Party Program and Statutes, fine, leave the party and create one of your own. But inside the party there must be ideological and organizational unity.

Finally, a few words about changing the party's name. All communists, or at the very least the overwhelming majority, say that they joined the Communist Party and therefore the question of changing its name to socialist or social democratic party does not arise for them. Is it not better to think about how our party should work in the present complex conditions and, together with the people, to find ways out of the crisis? Practical actions are expected of us.

V. Avgus: Just one more remark. I think the holding of a congress at which 5,000 delegates are represented does not make it possible to work constructively. I think that henceforth congresses should be held on a more modest scale, in a workmanlike atmosphere. So that everyone can express his opinion and submit or thoroughly discuss any proposal.

I. Frolov: Closing our conversation, I would like to say that it has been extremely useful. It is not for me to make any assessment of the speeches. For each person has his own position, which sometimes represents the position of entire collectives and party organizations. And that is probably the most important point—to most fully reveal the spectrum of public opinion in the process of the precongress debate in order to make it the asset of the entire party public and the entire people.

From the Editorial Office

On the eve of the 28th CPSU Congress PRAVDA is holding a number of meetings at the editorial office concerning the most urgent problems of perestroyka in the party and the country. There have already been conversations with workers and peasants. A report on them will be published in the next few days. Coming up are conversations with military men, young people, and others. The precongress debate remains the main topic in the newspaper.

Shostakovskiy on Platform Debate

90UN2087A Moscow TRUD in Russian
12 Jun 90 p 2

[Report on interview with Professor V. Shostakovskiy, member of the Democratic Platform Coordinating Council, conducted by N. Nadezhdina; date and place not given: "At the Cutting Edge of the Disputes"]

[Text] The party is approaching the 28th congress. The draft CPSU Central Committee Platform has been published. There are other platforms as well, and extensive discussion thereof is underway in the press. Party members are clarifying individual propositions of the CPSU Central Committee document. Keen, frequently critical

debate has developed around the "Democratic Platform." And this is a reality of the precongress struggle.... Today TRUD's questions are answered by Professor V. Shostakovskiy, member of the "Democratic Platform" Coordinating Council.

[Nadezhdina] What, in your opinion, has led to the emergence of different viewpoints on the paths of the party's development?

[Shostakovskiy] To answer briefly, the reasons lie in the state of our party. For a political organization of any type, radical transformations of the entire system of intraparty relations are a particular normality. Always, as soon as there is an appreciable change in social conditions in which a political organization has to operate, it, taking this into consideration, transforms itself. For a long time unfortunately this did not happen with the CPSU. An antidemocratic system of intraparty relations was established whereby power in the party was in the hands of particular groups of people, small boards, not even the entire elective Central Committee. Thousands of communists were on the one hand essentially alienated from the formulation of all-party decisions and, on the other, had to be their executants.

I believe that very many of the party's troubles stem from the fact that the processes of democratization of its internal life have not been radical in the perestroyka years either. But under the conditions of the general democratization of society what had essentially always existed in the party has been revealed; various currents with particular concepts concerning the development of society and the party itself have been manifested. I refer not only to the "Democratic Platform" but also a number of other movements, specifically the so-called organizing congress of the Russian Communist Party in Leningrad.... The resolution of this congress speaks of the unacceptability of a diversity of forms of ownership and rejects the laws on property and land which have already been enacted. This platform is very close to the ideas of the United Workers Front and certain propositions of the "Marxist Platform." The "Democratic" is built on different ideological principles.

[Nadezhdina] What are its basic features? What kind of party organization is "Democratic Platform"?

[Shostakovskiy] We are moving toward a multiparty system. It will actually take shape as a result of radical economic reform—with the appearance of multistructural conditions in our economy and the differentiation of people's interests, including political interests. The socioeconomic ground for the organization of various parties will then emerge, and this will naturally lead to competitive struggle between them.

It needs to be clearly seen that preserving its former structures, the party runs the risk of finding itself incapable in this struggle. The principle of democratic centralism—that is, the unconditional subordination of the lower to superior structures—will inevitably lead to the unjustifiably high role of the center. The problem of the majority and the minority is not resolved given this approach, and the minority, as history shows, frequently proves to be more far-seeing....

Nothing dreadful will happen, I believe, if there is debate in the party not only prior to the congress, but permanently. It should be seen as a method of party work, a search for the truth, the achievement of consensus, and formulation of the strategic course.

[Nadezhdina] But, after all, the CPSU Central Committee Platform speaks about a radical renewal of the party also. Are there most likely some points of contact in these documents?

[Shostakovskiy] Undoubtedly. The CPSU Central Committee Platform contains interesting and productive ideas. We are brought together by the fact that both platforms are oriented toward democratic socialism. We have also to share the propositions to the effect that man must be at the center of party policy and that the role of the party masses should be increased and the rights of the primary organizations broadened. But there is as yet, in my view, no mechanism which would ensure realization of these strategic tasks.

We advocate a staged change in the type of party and its conversion into a party of the parliamentary type. But this by no means signifies that it will live and operate "from election to election". No, the party will not interfere in the production process but some of its structures could remain in the work force, and this would help us obtain feedback and get to know the mood of the working people.

Why is the independence of all structures necessary? The local ones particularly? It is necessary in order to be able to operate on the basis of an orientation toward actual conditions and the problems which reality presents under these conditions. We believe that the communist should have the right to himself choose the party organization in which he wishes to work and in which he sees an opportunity for best realizing his political assertiveness. He could be a member of his territorial organization and could be a member in another area of some horizontal structure, special interest association, and work force organization.

No political organization can manage without an apparatus, but an entirely different apparatus is needed. In the middle and lower components it should be shaped per the decision of the communists themselves, and they should determine where it is necessary to have a technical secretary or sociologist as a full-time official and whom to enlist as a consultant. The communists themselves will decide whether to have rayon party committees or a primary party organization secretary council and a small apparatus attached to it....

We also advocate the federal principle of party arrangement, which is rejected by many people. The federal principle is also an element of elasticity. And one further point: the permissibility of factions. We have words

which instantly evoke a particular negative reaction. It is sufficient to utter "private property" to evoke such a reaction. Just the same with factions also. But, after all, the basis of a faction necessarily has to be some platform—a particular understanding of tactical tasks. Let us imagine that there were in our party a peasant faction, say, uniting people living in the country, with their very specific problems. I believe that this would enhance the authority of the party and its influence in the country....

[Nadezhdina] But what you are proposing will, your opponents believe, make the party amorphous and prevent it being the vanguard in all spheres of the life of society and tackling the tasks posed by perestroyka.

[Shostakovskiy] On the contrary. We are convinced that it is a reformed party oriented toward the electorate, a party of specific action, with independent structures, which would help shape the political conditions which would correspond to the idea of radical economic reform, and the reformation of our society in general. Whether we like it or not, it is on the party that the entire future course of our life depends to a large extent. There are in its ranks many vanguard forces of the people, I would say, and it is present in each cell of our society. But if the party preserves, even with certain adjustments, its old principles, its old approaches, it could, it seems to me, prove to be a factor of deceleration of perestroyka.

The market will summon into being diverse horizontal relations. And this will be difficult to combine with the party's strict vertical structures. In addition, a nonrenewed party preserving the centrist principle would come into ever increasing contradiction with the civil society taking shape here....

[Nadezhdina] Wide-ranging precongress debate is underway in the press and the party organizations. Are you satisfied with the course of the discussion?

[Shostakovskiy] Mention has to be made here of the party Central Committee's open letter to the country's communists. I cannot agree with it. How is it possible to call for open discussion on a democratic basis, a discussion leading to a comparison of the most varied views, and simultaneously appeal to the country's communists to "look into" ideological vacillation? And this label may now be sown on any person expressing his viewpoint. The entire composition of the organizing congress for the creation of a Russian Communist Party in Leningrad, say, could be expelled from the party for "ideological vacillation".

The endeavor to direct discussion only into a particular channel visible to certain members of the party Central Committee leads, as a rule, to the reverse results. To speak of the "Democratic Platform," on the one hand the letter evoked interest therein among people who had displayed no interest in any platforms. But, on the other, it displayed a certain fear also. I believe that this is natural, fear is in us, the historical memory is alive in each individual.

The more so in that this letter was understood in places as a signal for specific action. Several persons were expelled in the Ukraine, in Belorussia, in Moscow. Others left of their own accord.... But fairness requires that it be noted that people are joining the party too; there are people who sincerely believe that it is necessary to support the communists at this difficult time.

[Nadezhdina] Time is flying. Little time remains before the 28th congress. How, in your view, will events develop?

[Shostakovskiy] I believe that the composition of the congress will be quite traditional. The very delegate-election system will contribute to this. We called for a uniform procedure: only by party district, direct, secret, and multiple-choice elections. The decision which was adopted, however, was to leave it to the discretion of the party committees: consequently, it is possible to be elected at conferences also....

This will lead to the "Democratic Platform" being in the minority. Although it does not follow from this that there will be few democratic communists at the congress. Nonetheless, it will, I believe, occupy a centrist position.... Many people are linking their hopes with a radical renewal of the executive bodies. This is really important. But insufficient. Unless the system changes and intraparty relations are reformed fundamentally, the new party Central Committee will essentially change nothing, even if there are people there who think in the modern way.

And this will inevitably give a boost to the demarcation process. Some supporters of the "Democratic Platform" could leave and attempt to form a different, left party adhering to positions of democratic socialism, but with a different idea of progress toward it. There are other sentiments also: simply quitting the party and declining active participation in the political process. But some supporters of the "Democratic Platform"—30 percent, most likely—believe that even after the congress it will be necessary to remain in the party and struggle for its renewal. Although it is hard for me personally, to be honest, to imagine this: If the draft rules which have been prepared are adopted without serious amendments, "ideological vacillation" will be interpreted unambiguously—as being incompatible with party membership....

And one further point. I am currently most concerned by the overall situation in the country. After all, the debate in the party is no longer of an intraparty, but of a public nature. And what is most important is slipping away from it—the problem of service as the main function of a political organization. The party should serve the interests of the social strata of society which adhere to positions of democratic socialism since this is our basic strategic goal.

And to speak of the idea of service, the priority problem in society currently is, for all that, political stability. It seems to me that whatever political forces emerge, what should be most important for them is not confrontation

but an aspiration to civic harmony. Because instability could disrupt all the reform intentions and turn the situation back.

[Nadezhdina] You were nominated as a candidate for delegate to the 28th congress. How did the election turn out?

[Shostakovskiy] In a loss. A pity, of course. And it is not a question of myself; I would simply have liked different viewpoints to have been more extensively represented at the congress.

Opposition Should Drop 'Cliches'

PM08060851 90 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Jun 90 Second Edition p 4

[Article by V. Sogrin, chief editor of the journal OBSHCHESTVENNYYEE NAUKI, under the rubric "Polemical Notes" and the general heading "Discussion Page No. 42: Party and Perestroyka Approaching the 28th CPSU Congress": "Political Culture and Opposition"]

[Excerpts] The belief, based on world political experience, that the existence of a political opposition and its stated participation in the struggle for political power are beneficial to society and reinforce its vitality and the guarantee of progressive historical development is becoming increasingly deeply rooted in public opinion. But that same world experience demonstrates the existence of different possibilities and forms of interrelations between the authorities and the opposition, not all of which are the optimum ones or are acceptable for the development of democracies and highly civilized societies. In brief, this phenomenon, which is new to us, needs thought.

The optimum and, consequently, only acceptable forms are those which ensure nonviolent means of struggle and replacement of the parties in power and nonviolent means of social change, profound reform, and historical progress in general. The historical possibility of such forms of interrelations has been tested in a whole series of countries: I shall point in this case to the example of England, which has not known violent revolution for 350 years now and in many respects sets examples of historical progress. This is considerably due to forms and norms sometimes enshrined in law but which for the most part are based on the precedent of mutual relations between ruling party and opposition. These forms and norms are what is known as the parties' political culture.

The task of acquiring political culture is relevant to our society, too. We have observed how time and again in society passions overflow, particularly on the solution of ethnic problems, how "strong-arm methods" are used, and how the language of political ultimatums has become fashionable. It may be said, of course, that the people themselves bear the responsibility for this "infantile disorder" of democracy. But I find such an answer scarcely satisfactory. The character of rallies and demonstrations, their capacity for dialogue, compromise, and consensus, those most important indicators of political culture, are largely determined and will continue to be determined by those who lead the protest and who are rightly called leaders of the opposition today. Will they be able to place the interests of the country above their own political ambitions, repudiate the populist tendency of playing up to the feelings and emotions of the masses, and counter them with rational, scientifically validated remedies for society's ailments—the fate of perestroyka will also largely depend on that. [passage omitted]

Formally, one of the main demands voiced by the opposition is that of deideologization and the struggle against ideological cliches. But while dismissing with one hand those principles which are contrary to its views, the opposition constructs with the other its own ideological cliches—concepts and symbols which must be taken on trust and which have a clearly marked sociopolitical thrust.

Ideological cliche 1: The entire historical path traveled by the USSR has been profoundly wrong, the October Revolution was an artificial creation of the Bolsheviks headed by Lenin, and it was they who created the command and administration form of socialism and "diverted" Russia from the mainstream of mankind. [passage omitted]

Ideological cliche 2: Only the opposition is democratic and progressive; the CPSU cannot conduct perestroyka, and it has no perestroyka program at all. [passage omitted]

Ideological cliche 3: Social ownership is bankrupt, "private ownership alone is the most real guarantee both of people's freedoms and of all their rights" (that is the opinion of one of the most prominent opposition leaders). I believe that this ideological tenet will bewilder not only Marxists but also the majority of contemporary non-Marxists, from W. Brandt to J.K. Galbraith, who have convincingly demonstrated that the process of socializing private property, which lost its classic features long ago, is deep-rooted in the West. [passage omitted]

What is the inspiration behind the serious ideological games of an opposition which is formulating more and more new ideological cliches repudiating the socialist idea, and with it our society's socialist option? I believe that one of the main reasons is that reformist forces in the CPSU have firmly grasped the concept of humane, democratic socialism, which unites Marxist methodology with the assimilation of all common civilized values. This new concept of socialism sharply restricts the opposition's room for ideological maneuver and forces it to find for itself principled differences from the ruling party and address itself to those antisocialist principles which, I am convinced, are anachronistic compared not only with social democracy but also ewth contemporary bourgeois ideology. If you take a closer look at the opposition's ideological cliches, it is not hard to discover, I think, that they are motivated not only and

not so much by a search for certain ideals as by political ambitions and the desire to struggle for power by any means. And if that were not so, if the opposition waived its ambitions and ideological cliches, it would find a wealth of opportunity for compromise and cooperation with the CPSU's reformist course, which is so necessary, at least until the danger of the restoration of the command and administration system in the country is averted.

The opposition, rent by a power struggle, now increasingly frequently sees its main political adversary not in the conservatives but in the CPSU's reformist current which heads the state. Some opposition representatives are trying—yet another overtly propagandist ploy—to identify M.S. Gorbachev and other leaders of the CPSU's reformist wing with the reactionaries. The idea advanced by a number of opposition strategists of removing them from power corresponds precisely to the scheme of none other than... Nina Andreyeva, who demanded from like-minded conservatives at a rally in Moscow 23 February that they end the rule of the "rightwing-opportunist Gorbachev group..." Thus the crafty stratagems of the left-wingers seem to have brought them together with their implacable antagonists. This marriage shows more convincingly than any arguments what happens when you follow the principle that "the end justifies the means."

It is already common practice for the opposition to bestow on itself alone the title of "democrats" while dubbing "all opponents" conservatives and reactionaries. When put to the test, unfortunately, it appears that the opposition's sense of democracy is not of a very high standard, to put it mildly. A cochairman of the interregional deputies' group did not like being criticized in the party press and is already demanding that the CPSU "shut PRAVDA down." Another cochairman—this time of the Moscow writers' association "Aprel" (which, presumably, took its name from the Communist Party's April 1985 course) dislikes the CPSU as a whole and proposes holding a "nationwide referendum to decide whether the party has the right to exist at all." It is fair to ask the following question: If the opposition comes to power, will it not demand that the rights of "all opponents" be sacrificed on the altar of "democracy"?

People may object here: Democrats with marked Jacobin "distortions" surely form the minority in the opposition. Well, perhaps that is so: The views and aspirations of many of its representatives remain undisclosed and seem to be lost against the background of harsh and clamorous speeches from left-radical tribunes. But if the opposition as a whole is truly democratic, why does it appoint extreme left-wingers as its spokesmen, people with powerful voices, fierce looks, and a political vocabulary confined to labels and slogans? Just because they can control rallies? Do our liberals seriously believe that it is possible to establish a civilized, political democracy by such methods?

Perhaps some people, on reading this article, will say: The opposition in our country has only just been formed; there are bound to be excesses in its development: Is this the time to criticize them? I think that it is, for the reason that it is on the development of the opposition and alternative political tendencies that we pin special hopes of removing the shortcomings and defects of our past, including the hope of establishing a political culture. We will not escape from our slavery, our lack of freedom, unless we join the struggle for democracy to the acquisition of political culture. Otherwise, freedom threatens to develop into endless squabbling between different strata and groups over the division of the meager national cake, the redivision of "disputed territories," and the exposure of "culprits" and those "responsible" for the bankruptcy of barracks communism. In a situation of profound and multifaceted crisis, the efforts of all its strata and groups, including the opposition, must be aimed toward the elaboration and implementation of truly scientific, constructive, and undoubtedly nonviolent means of building a humane and democratic society, that is, one which is unrealizable without social and political consensus.

Democratic Party Platform Conference Reported

PM1906141590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Report by P. Gutiontov: "Will There Be a New Party? Second All-Union 'Democratic Party Within the CPSU' Conference Held in Moscow 16 and 17 June"]

[Text] The Leningrad "RCP [Russian Communist Party] initiative congress," which our newspaper has described, already showed clearly how far the process of the demarcation of forces has gone in the CPSU, which only recently appeared as a single monolith. And now, following the conservatives, who deny perestroyka from the positions of the "real" or "developed" socialism which we have experienced, a precongress review of ranks has been held by their opponents from the opposite flank. And while the "initiators" defended most resolutely the thesis of "the party's leading role all along the path to the complete surmounting of class differences," the "democrats," on the contrary, are convinced that "the party has become the main brake to perestroyka and all the reforms which are being carried out have come up against the party's monopoly of power."

There were 837 delegates from 12 union republics and 65 krays and oblasts and autonomous formations of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] taking part in the work of the conference. One quarter of the participants were people's deputies of various levels, including 18 USSR people's deputies.

Before the start of the conference its delegates and guests were able to familiarize themselves with the results of a sociological study conducted in 12 regions of the country. In the opinion of those who conducted the study, today the "Democratic Platform" program documents are approved by 42 percent of communists and another 34 percent believe they require additional work

while nine percent have a negative attitude toward them. The corresponding figures for the draft CPSU Central Committee Platform are 21, 32, and 18 percent and for the draft "Marxist Platform" 12, 14, and 12 percent (the remainder of those asked were not acquainted with the documents). But the "democrats" should consider that only one-fourth of those polled believe it expedient for various factions to exist within the CPSU and only 18 percent agree with the other key idea of the "Democratic Platform"—the abolition of the production principle for the structure of party organizations.

And so, with what will the "Democratic Platform" come to the 28th congress, to which over 100 of its supporters have been elected delegates? What ideas will they defend there? To judge by the drafts of the precongress documents which have been distributed, the organizers of the conference counted primarily on formulating answers to precisely these questions. But it looks as though talked turned to far more fundamental things. In particular, whether the "Democrats" should take part in the work of the congress at all. In any case many speakers stated frankly that they must distance themselves from "that party" and leave for a different political space.

Essentially the difference in approaches was merely a question of schedules. Whether to make the conference a constituent one and elect the new party's organizational committee at it. Or whether to "slam the door" at the 28th congress, which would be the only point in taking part in it. Or whether to wait until the congress ends anyway in order to announce withdrawal if no compromise is successfully reached.

I must say that on the first day of the conference's work I saw few people anxious to reach such a compromise. Thus, V. Shestakovskiy, rector of the Moscow party school, called for the renunciation of confrontationist ideology, recalling the danger involved in the colossal potential of conservatism accumulated in society. "Our movement can display civic maturity and civic responsibility," he said. "Otherwise the country may slide toward authoritarianism and this danger grows together with the polarization of forces." And only then did he suggest "uniting on the soil of the nonrecognition of the congress results"—in advance. "Remaining in the ranks of the CPSU in order to be the party's interface with the democratic forces," urged V. Lepitskiy, member of the "Democratic Platform" coordination council. "When all's said and done life does not end with the 28th congress." V. Grinev, deputy chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, stressed that the Ukrainian parliament's work will in his opinion be determined to a considerable degree by the ideas of the democratic center, which serves as the consolidating factor there, and he stated that the "democrats" must continue to take on this mission. At the same time he also voiced the doubt that reform of the CPSU is actually possible. "Moreover," he said, "having gotten involved in futile discussion at the congress, we may lose authority among the masses and find ourselves on the sidelines of the historical process."

In general, to judge by the first day of the conference, the majority of those taking part are in favor of parting resolutely with the CPSU. I repeat, the only question is when to leave, how (not one by one but in an organized manner), where to (a party is necessary that is capable of uniting all the country's democratic forces), and, finally, what with (they have in mind the demand to divide party property). USSR people's deputy and 28th congress Delegate Yu. Boldyrev raised what he called a fundamental question: Either we are the party's heirs and consequently must be answerable for all it has done or we must renounce its legacy. Because we cannot dissociate ourselves from its sins and not pay its debts. "At the congress," Boldyrev suggested, "we must separate and state immediately that we will immediately return to the people that part of the property which we are able to have adjudged to us..."

A. Machkauskas, member of the (independent) Lithuanian Communist Party Central Committee bureau, addressed greetings to the conference participants, thanking the "Democratic Platform" "for supporting blockaded Lithuania" and setting forth his party's viewpoint of the situation in the republic.

The speech delivered at the conference by KGB General O. Kalugin, who retired from this post in March, was a real sensation. He spoke of the danger which in his view continues to be presented to society as it is being democratized by the state security organs "the total number of whose staffers is in excess of the total numerical strength of the special services of America, Europe, and Asia (perhaps not counting China) taken together." He advocated the depoliticization of the organs, halving them at least, eliminating the system of political vetting, renouncing the services of informers, and immediately dismantling the structures for the dissemination of misinformation in the country and abroad. The KGB's methods of work, he stressed, have remained the same as before, but the "organs" have now been split, like all society. And while part of the apparatus has moved "left," the majority remains the bulwark of the most conservative party circles. General Kalugin noted that this was his first public statement, but he began to write his memorandums "to the top ranks" back in 1986 when he worked as first deputy chief of the KGB directorate for Leningrad Oblast. To judge by the interests of the numerous correspondents of Western publications, this speech will be covered widely in the world press...

On Sunday there was a stormy discussion of the conference's draft resolutions right through to the evening. Right now, as the newspaper is being prepared for the press, its main decisions have not yet been taken. But whatever these decisions may be, it is already clear that not only "from the right" but also "from the left" the threat to the party's unity is essentially irreversible.

Peasant Union Congress Decisions Examined

PM1906085790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Konovalov report under "On Topics of the Day" rubric: "What Farmers Could Not Say"]

[Text] The work of the founding congress of the USSR Peasants' Union ended 13 June. We will talk about its results later. The main news is that a decision has been adopted on the formation of the country's Peasants' Union. V. Starodubtsev has been elected chairman.

So, a new all-Union organization has appeared. Whom does it represent and whose interests does it defend? This natural question is far from straightforward. Even less so for journalists. After all, a large place in the speeches at the congress was occupied by complaints against the mass media, which cover its work and agricultural problems in general not in the way that the speakers would like. Our paper was also ticked off.

V. Starodubtsev stated that IZVESTIYA's agrarian journalists have forgotten to whom the paper belongs and are guided only by their personal interests. In general, of all the mass media, in his opinion, only PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA have remained faithful to the people's interests.

In his speech to the congress E. Ligachev said that he entirely shares V. Starodubtsev's opinion about the press. The CPSU Central Committee secretary also made it plain that the claims of "some experts," flying a private property flag, about the possibility of famine in the country and the breakdown of the agricultural economy should be considered fabrications. He himself, in his words, is an optimist and supports diversity in the forms of management in the countryside, while giving priority to public ownership and believing firmly in the prospects of the kolkhoz [collective farm] and sovkhoz [state farm] system.

Many of the delegates who spoke in their turn fully shared these thoughts of the Central Committee secretary. Only his wish that the Peasants' Union be "attached" to the CPSU provoked strong objection.

If we sum up the problems posed at the congress, they amount to the following. It is essential to restore the country's Ministry of Agriculture and Agricultural Supplies Department [Agrosnab]. Prices of food and industrial products must be brought into line. Investment in agriculture needs to be sharply increased.

These demands are perhaps somewhat debatable but fully understandable. They were voiced on the peasants' behalf mainly by farm directors, who were the overwhelming majority of those at the congress. True, one of the speakers explained to stormy applause that chairmen and directors should not be considered as management apparatus.

"They are production laborers, or more precisely, peasants," he said. "I myself, a kolkhoz chairman, am one of them..."

To be fair it must be said that another opinion on this score exists among the participants in the congress. Perhaps it is best reflected by the statement signed by a group of farmers. But its authors waited in vain in the line by the microphones, and in vain sent notes to the presidium to be given the floor. What did they wish to say?

"... We are convinced that the main question today, and a vitally important one for our agriculture, is the genesis of new forms of management based on individual and family peasant labor. A method of transferring land to new masters [khozyayeva], and a system of measures and guarantees for their development, are badly needed now.

"... Instead of this, calls to protect the kolkhoz and sovkhoz system and demands to improve its material basis are heard in speech after speech.

"... Especially alarming are intentions to set up yet another monopoly-command organ which will 'win' resources and distribute them and thereby control the peasant. The persistent proposals for the union's chairman and his deputy to join the Presidential Council and the Council of Ministers are also dictated by this very aim. To preside alone in the name of peasants means to damage the rights of other peasants' organizations which already operate or will be set up.

"...Of course, a union of kolkhoz chairmen, which this congress, to all intents and purposes, essentially constitutes, has the right to exist among the rest. But this is by no means the entire peasant population. And appropriating for ourselves the right to speak and act in its name is not warranted, either.

"We firmly disagree with speakers that, in criticizing V. Starodubtsev, President Gorbachev was offending the entire peasant population. We, autonomous peasants, are in solidarity with the president in his support for new forms of management and in condemnation of those who are blocking their development..."

The congress did not hear this. But nonetheless words about the difficulties and dangers threatening peasants were heard from the rostrum. One speaker told how, in his oblast, a lessee threw a grenade at a kolkhoz chairman, and therefore the union should guarantee the security of farm leaders.

In short, the true peasantry must be protected. Of this there is no doubt.

Mineworkers' Congress Results Reported

PM1906135590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 17 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 3

[Report by IZVESTIYA correspondent Nikolay Lisovenko: "What the Miners Decided. First USSR Miners Congress Ends in Donetsk"]

[Text] Donetsk—There were many issues to resolve. Above all, what to do about the congress planned by the Mining Industry Workers Trade Union Central Council and the Ministry of the Coal Industry in Moscow in August: Should it be considered a continuation of the current congress or an entirely different event?

They decided it would be a different event. Therefore they set up an organizing committee and gave it the power, after consulting with labor collectives, to decide on both the venue and the time for the next congress. They were also concerned about ensuring that the forthcoming congress be a forum of workers, consequently they voted in favor of collectives delegating to it representatives of pits, open cuts, and enrichment plants of no higher than sector chief level.

Trade union issues were raised very acutely. Applause greeted the proposal from the Gorlovka delegates that the Ministry of the Defense Industry should pay miners at the "Aleksandr-Zapad" Pit R22 million for polluting their enterprise's mineworkings and leaving people jobless.

The same acuteness was also evident as regards politics. Several resolutions—including a resolution on attitudes to the CPSU—were proposed, and a demand was voiced to remove party committees from coal enterprises, to nationalize CPSU property, and so forth. The Lugansk delegation protested framing the question in this way, but nonetheless the resolution was adopted 308 to 116.

The miners gave a thunderous reception to speeches from representatives of U.S., Italian, and Spanish trade unions.

At the end of the working day the congress' main document—the "Resolution on Questions of the Socioeconomic Situation, the Fulfillment of USSR Council of Ministers Resolution 608, and the Prospects for the Transition to the Market"—was adopted.

Constitution Oversight Chairman Interviewed

PM1806142590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 2

[Interview with S. Alekseyev, chairman of the Constitutional Oversight Committee, by observer Yu. Feofanov: "Legal Adviser or Fully Empowered Guard of Legality"; date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] [Feofanov] I shall not conceal that I was somewhat surprised by the election of the Constitutional Oversight Committee: voting through a list, without any discussion, at the session at least. As agreed, you, Sergey Sergeyevich, and your deputy were elected by the Congress of People's Deputies and you were both presented, although the whole country had learned to recognize you long ago anyway. But appointing the entire committee personnel from a list? What is that, in your opinion: lack of understanding, underestimate, haste?

[Alekseyev] Probably a little of all of these. But I do not agree that it was without discussion. The deputies were thoroughly acquainted with all members of the committee. I can, however, agree that the constitutional oversight institution has not yet been assessed by the public. We have virtually no experience. It is true that there was some in the early twenties. But everyone has forgotten it and in general there has been no full constitutional control. So that we have everything ahead of us.

[Feofanov] Then please formulate in a couple of words what the committee is. And what you see as its main task. After all, oversight of the observance of the Constitution is a very general term. What avenues of work will the committee choose?

[Alekseyev] I shall say the main thing immediately. The constitutional oversight committee is a collegium empowered by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, independent of any other state organs and public organizations and designed to render unshakable the supreme legal values embodied in the Constitution. The committee—although this may sound unusual to many people—is "no one's" organ, it does not belong to the USSR Supreme Soviet, the USSR President, or the party. It should serve one single god—the USSR Constitution. And no one else.

An important nuance in understanding the function of the committee, somewhat overshadowed by what is frankly an unfortunate word in its title—"oversight"—is that it should not be yet another monitoring and oversight body (how many of them we have!), almost another prosecutor's office or "state eye." The committee's function is to be a **legal court** above the laws and other normative legal acts from the positions of the Constitution and the supreme legal principles, ideals, and principles of the true rule-of-law state which it expresses. And from that viewpoint to be the bulwark of the rule-of-law state.

As for the avenue of the committee's work, that should be primarily **human rights and freedoms and their absolute nature.** It is perhaps possible to say even more: The Constitution in the sense indicated above is in general primarily a fundamental law on the unshakable human rights and freedoms—the right to life, to personal security and inviolability, to equality before the law, to unconditional and reliable defense, to freedom of travel and place of residence, to freedom of speech, to the freedom to choose one's work, and so forth. And in this connection, in this connection, the Constitution is a law about the precise and unconditional borders, boundaries, and framework for the activity of state organs and the permissibility and possibility of their interference in a person's life and activity.

[Feofanov] When the first congress discussed the question of instituting constitutional oversight there were many fundamental objections. It was said that our constitution was unsuitable, that it was a "Stalin-Brezhnev" constitution. And it has to be defended? the

deputies asked. Nonetheless, the committee was created and the Constitution is still the same, albeit with substantial amendments. Nonetheless, Sergey Sergeyevich, does this not discredit a priori the authority of the very institution of constitutional oversight?

[Alekseyev] No, I don't think so. The law is always better than lawlessness and tyranny. It is from these positions, in my view, that we should examine the existing 1977 Constitution, the Constitution which right now, until a new one is adopted, is designed to be the basis and criterion for assessments and decisions submitted by the Constitutional Oversight Committee.

Unfortunately, the press and publicist statements and discussions have given currency to the opinion (it is true that it has never been reasoned by anyone) that the 1977 Constitution is a purely Brezhnevite document, obsolete and unsuitable in every way. Well, the 1977 Constitution and in particular its pretentious provisions and phraseology, above all in the preamble, contains direct echoes of those times. And, of course, our renewed society insistently demands a new constitutional act which would ensure in full the country's free democratic development and would assert a humane and democratic system in it.

At the same time I shall venture to assert that the existing Constitution, particularly if you take account of the amendments and additions made to it, and especially in the context of the legal infrastructure which exists "as of today," also expresses truly legal, humanitarian, and democratic principles. It contains "letters" and normative provisions which, reflecting the movement toward democracy after "Khrushchev's thaw," developed surreptitiously but insurmountably even in the stagnation times and make it possible to see the fundamental and profound elements which can and must be placed at the basis of the committee's assessments and decisions. After all it was the 1977 Constitution which first contained the word "glasnost" (Article 9), which enshrined the principles of legality in the activity of state organs and officials (Article 4), of the subordination of the activity of officials to the court (Article 58), and the presumption of innocence (Article 160), and others. In addition substantial "perestroyka" additions and amendments have recently been introduced to the Constitution, opening the way to a multiparty system, the multiplicity of forms of ownership, and the division of powers within the state. And, no less important, the Constitution now functions in a new legal infrastructure for society. The congress of people's deputies and the USSR Supreme Soviet have adopted a whole series of new laws which reveal in a new way, in a spirit of renewal, the meaning of the constitution's clauses. Moreover, the clause on human rights enshrined in international acts to which the USSR is a signatory are also of themselves the basis for the committee's assessments and decisions. Thus, in particular, the citizen's rights mentioned by the Constitution must be understood and ensured as general human rights and freedoms with all ensuing characteristics—their inalienability from man, unshakability, and the need for their unconditional defense.

I think that the committee has confirmed in practice this approach toward an understanding of the clauses of the existing USSR Constitution by adopting for examination at its first official session precisely those questions which concerned the important aspects of the country's democratic development and the assertion and defense of basic human rights and freedoms (the questions of normative juridical acts relating to registration and restrictions—acts which exist when defending citizens' labor rights, defending consumers' rights, and others).

[Feofanov] And how will the committee work in practice? In concept it is equal to the Supreme Soviet and the president, equal, naturally, in a specific sense. All three institutions receive full powers from the congress. Can the committee impose a "veto" on a law or decree of the president? What are its powers in general?

[Alekseyev] The constitutional oversight committee is a fundamentally new and unique state structure also from the viewpoint of the nature of its activity. Although the committee has the right to take legally important decisions—on the suspension of the activity of specific normative acts and even, when basic human rights and freedoms are violated, on their complete forfeiture of power—the committee is neither a "prosecutor's" nor an administrative body. And in that respect it is closer to a court and to court activity with, of course, the important stipulation that it is not specific instances and legal cases, not facts of the application of laws, but these laws themselves and other normative acts and their compliance with the Constitution which are the subject of its examination. The law on constitutional oversight makes no exceptions to this fundamental provision.

[Feofanov] If the committee's main task is the protection of citizens' rights, as you said above, then citizens will naturally turn to you. It must be taken into account that for all the enormous number of control and auditing and other bodies a person has no one to whom to turn for effective aid. And now an unfamiliar but in people's eyes authoritative body has appeared. So can they... In particular I know from the newspaper how many complaints there are of a legal nature and how much dissatisfaction there is with court decisions. They will all inevitably surge toward you.

[Alekseyev] I must say frankly that the committee does not have the right to accepts complaints and statements on specific court, arbitration, administrative, or other juridical matters. The law on constitutional oversight in the USSR states: "The Constitutional Oversight Committee's oversight functions do not extend to sentences and other court decisions or to decisions of the organs of investigation, the prosecutor's office, or state board of arbitration on civil, criminal, administrative, or arbitration cases" (Article 10). The committee does not even have the right to pass on complaints and statements on

these matters to the relevant competent organs. Because in that case it would be assuming functions which are not its own—those of lending its name to support individual complaints and statements.

Next, the committee is not an organ for "immediate response" to laws and other normative acts (and in particular, which is absolutely ruled out, to specific facts) which particular people regard as a violation of the Constitution. The committee's members and chairman and deputy do not have the right to give explanations and consultations on questions coming within the sphere of management of the committee. On this point too the law clearly states: "Committee members do not have the right to state publicly their opinion on the compliance or noncompliance with the USSR Constitution and USSR laws of acts and draft acts which are being examined by the committee before the committee has adopted a conclusion on this question" (Article 15).

[Feofanov] When the question of instituting the committee was being discussed the opinion was voiced: Why not invest the court with its powers? After all there is a formed system there, procedures which have been developed, and cadres. Nonetheless we decided to institute a special committee.

[Alekseyev] I fear the discussion of this question will drag out our conversation. In different countries constitutional oversight is implemented by different organs. In the United States by the Supreme Court, in France by the constitutional council, in Britain by no one, because there is no constitution there. So "what is best?" is an idle question.

Now regarding procedures. The committee's activity is subject to strict procedure stipulated by the law. In particular the USSR Constitution and Article 12 of the law on the committee provide for a precise procedure for submitting questions for examination by the committee and determine exhaustively for which kind of acts who and which specific organ can raise the relevant question to the committee and only when this procedure is observed is the committee legally obliged to examine the question. Here it has been stipulated that "if the organs of state management and court, prosecutor's office, and other law protection and law enforcement organs, public organizations, and citizens discover discrepancies between a law or other normative act and the USSR Constitution, they bring this to the attention of the organ empowered to pass on the question for examination by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee (Article 12). Consequently, in compliance with the law, let us assume that people's deputies, representatives of local public organizations, or individual citizens appeal to the relevant organs mentioned by the law, that is, to the soviet of people's deputies or the public organization's all-union organ which are empowered to submit questions to the committee and it is these organs which pass on the question to the committee.

[Feofanov] And the examination of questions at the committee's "own initiative?"

[Alekseyev] According to the law, which demands strict adherence to the established procedure, such examination is in my view justified and permissible in cases when the procedure envisaged by the law for instituting proceedings has been used but "hasn't worked," and the question itself is so fundamental and important for the democratic foundations of Soviet society and the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and freedoms and has been firmly established, in all its keenness, in the country's public opinion that its raising in the committee is an urgent necessity. This fundamental importance and urgency is, it must be supposed, characteristic of questions which have now been adopted for examination by the committee, for instance questions of normative acts affecting the rights of the consumer, about which the press has long been speaking, while the society for the protection of consumers' rights has been keenly raising problems (it has submitted quite extensive materials to the committee).

The USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee, having begun work, has firmly tuned itself to a civic wavelength and intends to assert in life the principles and ideals of the rule-of-law state and to be its bulwark.

Supreme Court Chairman on Judicial Independence

LD1806125890 Moscow World Service in English 1100 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] The chairman of the USSR Supreme Court, Yevgeniy Smolentsev, has expressed the view that in conditions when society is becoming more democratic, new steps should be taken to strengthen the independence of judicial bodies. He said that it would, therefore, be better to elect or appoint the judges for their life term. As a result, the courts would not only be more independent but also more authoritative. Mr. Smolentsev said that lately the new legislation on the judicial system has been approved and it made more effective the protection of human rights and the interests of society.

Chernobyl Fund Suit Shows Rule-of-Law Progress

PM1906113790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 p 1

[D. Andreyev report: "Lawsuit—A Noble Cause"]

[Text] Let us make a mental note of the date: On 13 June 1990, at 1430 hours, in the presence of press representatives, Vladimir Panov handed over documents petitioning the USSR Public Prosecutor's Office to bring a lawsuit on behalf of the Krasnoyarsk environmental organization "Green World" against the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry and the USSR Ministry of Finance.

The nature of the suit is simple.

After Chernobyl, we managed to collect just over 542,999,000 rubles [R]—some people donating R1, others as much as R10—for the tragic Account No. 904 to aid the victims of this quiet nuclear "bombardment" and also to eliminate its consequences.

Now then: On instructions from directive bodies (the USSR Council of Ministers, USSR State Planning Committee, and USSR Ministry of Finance), R65 MILLION OF PEOPLE'S DONATIONS HAVE BEEN TRANSFERRED TO THE USSR MINISTRY OF NUCLEAR POWER GENERATION AND THE NUCLEAR INDUSTRY. As the "Greens" have managed to establish, this is to compensate for the damage this department incurred during the accident at the nuclear power plant. Under which law?! "Green World" activists are asking.

I know that from a legal viewpoint this lawsuit obviously does not stand a chance, because all the necessary resolutions and instructions exist.

But the suit also has another aspect, which outweighs a million legal technicalities and "healthy considerations": It is blasphemous, seditious, and cynical to give away the people's money—collected kopek by kopek—to the ministry that is to blame for our tragedy. It is the ministry that should be made to pay many times over in this terrible connection!

From this point of view the suit is irreproachable.

It is also irreproachable and unique because it sets up for the first time a situation whereby a social organization and people have acted on their initiative and decided to call the state to account—in the form of two of its ministries. I think that now, with informal movements gathering momentum, there will ultimately be more lawsuits like this one. That is right: Our legal system consigns far too much to the archives simply because the defendant is some abstract "state," which often conceals very real departments and people. In any real rule-of-law state, lawsuits of this kind are brought and are vindicated. There is hope that our laws too will finally become impartial in this respect.

Meeting on Tyumen Oil Workers' Concerns Viewed

PM1806091390 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "How Are Oil and Gas Industry Workers' Problems Being Resolved?"]

[Text] As part of the monitoring procedure a meeting under N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, once again heard reports from ministry and department leaders as to how they are carrying out the government's instructions issued at the end of March following the meeting with oil and gas industry workers. In this instance measures relating to Tyumen Oblast—the country's main oil and gas extraction center—were examined.

Ye.K. Ligachev; Yu.D. Maslyukov; L.A. Gorshkov, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Council of Ministers; V.S. Chertishchev, first secretary of Tyumen CPSU Obkom [Oblast Party Committee]; and leaders of central economic departments and trade union organs took part in the work of the meeting.

The implementation of the protocol of 28 March "On Measures To Improve the Work of the Oil Industry in 1990" has focused the attention of many central organs on resolving oil and gas industry workers' accumulated problems and overcoming social difficulties, particularly in Western Siberia. A number of questions relating to the provision of material and technical resources, equipment, and transport for oil and gas extraction enterprises have been resolved and funding of production and nonproduction construction facilities is under way. Tyumen Oblast has been allocated additional funds for food and industrial goods. Transport services for residents of Western Siberia have been extended for the summer vacation period. A government commission has been set up to examine and settle a whole set of questions relating to the development of the oil and gas industry in Western Siberia.

However, L.I. Filimonov, minister of the oil and gas industry, and V.G. Chirsko, minister of construction of oil and gas industry enterprises, pointed out that many important questions relating to production activity and people's lives have not yet been settled. There is not even enough piping, sheet metal, tractor and special equipment, pumping equipment, and construction materials for this year. Questions of next year's supplies are unclear.

Supplies of meat products to Western Siberia from annual stocks are unsatisfactory. The Tatar and Bashkir ASSR's [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics] have permitted a particularly tangible breakdown in deliveries. It is now summer and there are hardly any greens in Siberians' stores.

The state of affairs with regard to housing construction in oil and gas industry workers' cities and settlements is a cause of great concern. Western Siberia performs all-union fuel tasks, hence the republics have plans for the construction of housing here. However, some still adhere to a vague position on this question, which is detrimental to the interests of the country and hence to the republics, which need sizable amounts of oil and gas.

In his speech at the meeting Ye.K. Ligachev pointed out that in addition to republic participation the local housing construction base in Western Siberia must be expanded and the population must be ensured a fuller supply of food products from on-the-spot production. There is an opportunity to considerably expand hothouses in order to grow vegetables all year round. In the opinion of specialists, the time has come to consider the

question of combining oil extraction and processing in a single complex. Wishes regarding ministries and local party organs were voiced.

Addressing the leaders of the USSR Gosplan [State Planning Commission], the USSR Gossnab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], and ministries and departments, N.I. Ryzhkov said that a persistent approach must be displayed in the implementation of the "Tyumen Protocol" since it is a question of the country's main fuel center. Despite the country's economic difficulties, an effort must be made to fulfill the state order for oil and gas and improve the life of this region's population.

Meeting Discusses Auditing Commission Clause

LD1606130590 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1223 GMT 16 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 16 June (TASS)—A meeting of the group preparing for the 28th party congress, which is putting the finishing touches to the clause on the CPSU's Central Control and Auditing Commission, has taken place in the CPSU Central Committee. It was attended by a number of congress delegates. Those assembled voiced concrete proposals and observations on the draft clause on the commission. The meeting was chaired by Boris Pugo, candidate member of the Politburo and chairman of the Party Control Committee under the CPSU Central Committee.

Deputy Health Minister Baranov Views Problems

LD1706205890 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1400 GMT 17 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast; interview with USSR First Deputy Health Minister Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Baranov by presenter Vladimir Molchanov]

[Text] [Molchanov] Our medical workers are today celebrating their national day—USSR Medical Workers' Day—and we therefore have in the studio USSR First Deputy Minister of Health Aleksandr Aleksandrovich Baranov.

We congratulate you and all medical workers on your day. No doubt you are in a festive mood, but I fear that the mood of most Soviet people, particularly in small towns and villages where medical assistance is just as essential, may be rather different. What results are you bringing with you as you reach this festive day, and what can we expect, let's say, by the end of this year?

[Baranov] Where results for 1989 are concerned, infant mortality came down by nine percent: There were 26,000 fewer deaths of children under age two; incidence of infectious diseases among children declined by 30-40 percent, primarily in the case of those diseases for which we innoculate; and mortality in general declined a little. But the incidence of injuries remains very high, the level of road deaths, that is deaths of people from violent causes.

We expect 1990 to be an important year for determining the juridical function of health care. We are preparing a law on health care for the people, a law on transfer to state-insured medicine. But we have a money problem, a finance problem. We are spending on average today three to four times less on health care than the world's developed countries, and that is the main problem today.

[Molchanov] We have mentioned the countryside, the question of people in need of medical assistance in rural localities. Is it indeed the case that life expectancy in the countryside is much lower than in the towns?

[Baranov] It is two years less. And infant morality is 30 percent higher. The problem here is both labor protection for rural dwellers and that of making qualified medical assistance available. In other words, the problem is primarily one of getting sick people—both children and adults—to where assistance can be provided. So we have to think about this, seek reserves. I, for instance, would redesignate all the aircraft used for chemical crop-spraying and use them for health care purposes. Because this is a very important problem, one of combatting the irrational use of pesticides and chemical weed killers. We have poisoned the land, we have poisoned our foodstuffs. And we must put an end to this.

[Molchanov] Aleksandr Aleksandrovich, another question that has caused great concern of late: There are hardly any medicines to be found in our pharmacies. What is going on?

[Baranov] We are hostage to the Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry. It is they who manufacture the medicines. There is a similar problem with medical equipment. These industries require very considerable investment, and this is something the government is now dealing with. We have obtained additional funds for foreign curency purchases and we are buying in medicines.

[Molchanov] Well, thank you. I think every one of us in need of medical assistance would like to wish you success. All the best.

Head of TV, Radio Discusses Greater Freedom

LD1506203290 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] The chairman of Soviet Television and Radio, Mikhail Nenashev, has said at a press conference in Moscow that these services see their main mission in helping consolidate society and reach a national accord. They are now changing their style toward more democracy and independence. Air time can be allotted to various political parties and organizations on a regular basis.

The question if his membership in the Communist Party was hampering that independence, Nenashev replied that the issue can be raised at the coming congress of the Communist Party.

Economic

Abalkin Stresses Regulated Market Economy

LD2006090890 Moscow World Service in English 0710 GMT 20 Jun 90

[Excerpts] The Soviet Government's plan for transition to a market economy and subsequent price rises was defeated last week by the country's central parliament, the Supreme Soviet, and our parliamentary correspondent has this report:

[Begin recording] [Correspondent] [passage omitted] The government is in a dilemma. On the one hand it is being pushed with strong actions to get the country out of the present crisis, but on the other it is hamstrung by calls for caution because of fears that things might get worse.

For his part, Deputy Prime Minister Mr. Leonid Abalkin, who is one of the main brains behind the government's plan, has a different view. He says:

[Abalkin, in Russia fading to English translation] I believe that this country, an advanced great nation, can have no future without a regulated market economy. If we don't adopt these new methods we'll deny ourselves and our children, in fact we'll deny the whole of the nation, an opportunity to enjoy living in a powerful and proud country.

Dr. Abalkin believes the government worked hard on the program it submitted to parliament. He said leading scientists and many economic managers had taken part. All of them, he pointed out, had tried to forsee and forestall difficulties and they energetically worked out social guarantees primarily for people living off low incomes and with fixed wages and large families. As for a price increase, a move that definitely clashes with concern about low income people, Dr. Abalkin said there wasn't to be any marked increase. Under the government program consistent and gradual steps are to be taken with certain regulators on a price ceiling to be committed.

Dr. Abalkin further said: We've by and large launched this process. One cannot but see it is underway. The fruits and vegetables taken in last year have been selling at free prices for almost six months. As for a regulator, we committed local governing bodies to keep this kind of freedom under control. I believe administration of foreign prices are not what market economy needs. This economy is primarily oriented to free prices, though the notion of freedom, too, has its limits and does not rule out a regulated mechanism.

[Correspondent] Even before the government brought its program to parliament, Dr. Abalkin predicted that this program would be rejected, but he did make it public because national interests prevail. As you probably know, parliament returned the program for the government to improve. Dr. Abalkin again:

[Abalkin] I believe any programs for radical reforms—and we're in for a very radical reform—require a measure of accord. No reforms can be carried out without it. That is why understanding must be sought here too, and at the same time, the policy itself must be pursued steadfastly. Once we've launched reforms we must not give them up. [end recording]

Abalkin, Others Defend Economic Program

904A0429A Moscow EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN in Russian No 24, Jun 90 pp 4-5

[Report by P. Korotkov and A. Matveyev: "Market-Prices-Social Security"]

[Text] The previous issue of our newspaper carried a speech by USSR Council of Ministers Chairman N.I. Ryzhkov and his responses to the questions of participants in a meeting between the editorial board and writers of the newspaper and the working people of the city of Moscow held on 29 May in the Hall of Columns of the House of Unions. The meeting, sponsored by the editorial board of EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN, was devoted to issues of transition to a regulated market economy and the social security of the populace. We offer our readers answers to questions by other participants in the meeting.

Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Chairman of the State Commission for Economic Reform L.I. Abalkin

[Unidentified participant] It is known that the government has prepared a draft law on joint stock companies and limited liability partnerships and small enterprises. When is it planned to adopt these very important and much-needed documents?

[Abalkin] Taking into account that many laws prepared by the government have been under consideration by the Supreme Soviet for a long time (for example, some laws whose drafts were submitted to the Supreme Soviet on 1 September of last year still have not been adopted), whereas market relations need to be developed, temporary regulations will be adopted by the government as legal, normative acts on a number of significant issues, including those affecting joint stock companies and small enterprises.

Naturally, they will be invalidated in the future after the USSR Supreme Soviet adopts corresponding laws.

[Unidentified participant] Our transition to the market presupposes an increase in retail prices. Therefore, the standard of living of many people will decline, and social tensions will mount. Will this not bring about mass strikes which will paralyze the economic life of our country? Or does the government believe that this will not happen?

[Abalkin] This is a very characteristic question. Indeed, the wages of those who make R270 or more will increase by 15 percent on the average. The percentage of increase

will be higher for those who make less than R270. For example, if your salary comes to R100, and R40 are added to it as the government concept calls for, this amounts to a 40-percent wage increase. However this is not the main point either. At present, there are 130 million employees in the country, whereas 290 million people will get raises—all children, regardless of the number of them in the family, all retirees and the handicapped, all students, all dependents who do not study, do not work, and do not draw retirement benefits. In a word, everyone will get a raise. This is why on the whole 70 percent of the increases in retail prices will be compensated.

As far as strikes are concerned, I believe that there are no grounds for raising the issue in this manner. It is nonsensical and maybe even criminal to introduce the reform and switch to the market without securing prior approval by the people. This means ruining the entire endeavor. This is why public consent is one of the premises for switching to the market economy.

[Unidentified participant] How do you view the process of the withdrawal of the state from the sphere of services?

[Abalkin] The concept of state withdrawal is outlined in a quite detailed manner in the report of the government, and the structure of this process in various spheres is discussed: in industry, agriculture, transportation, the sphere of services, and so on. It is expected that a large segment of small and maybe medium-size enterprises of trade and public catering should be either leased or sold, to be owned as individual or family property, before the end of this year. This will create the necessary foundation for the development of the market.

[Unidentified participant] What is the position of the government with regard to the issue of private property and hired labor?

[Abalkin] As has already been said repeatedly, we are against the development of private property with the use of hired labor. This is unacceptable and incompatible with the socialist option taken by our country.

[Unidentified participant] The report of the government says almost nothing about monetary reform. What is your attitude toward the prospect of stabilizing the ruble and attaining its convertibility?

[Abalkin] The proposed concept of the transition to a regulated market economy contains a thorough and detailed study of the issues of invigorating monetary circulation in the country, strengthening the ruble, moving toward its convertibility and a more stable situation in international relations. For the first time, the task of carrying out the devaluation of the ruble, and at a sufficiently high rate, taking into account the emerging price ratios and the financial position of the country, has acquired a practical dimension. This would be a major step in providing incentives for the export of their products by Soviet enterprises, and would restrict imports. In the process, the existing rate of the ruble for noncommercial transactions will be maintained.

[Unidentified participant] Will the three-percent tax paid by enterprises on labor-remuneration funds remain in place in the environment of a market economy?

[Abalkin] As is known, this tax should apply until 31 December 1990. A new system of taxation, which is under consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet at present, may only be introduced beginning next year.

[Unidentified participant] What is the essence of the forthcoming credit reform proposed by the government? What is the future of specialized state banks—the Industrial Construction Bank, the Bank for Housing and Municipal Services and Social Development, and the Agro-Industrial Bank?

[Abalkin] Very shortly, two laws will be submitted for consideration by the USSR Supreme Soviet: "On the USSR State Bank" and "On Banks and Banking." Under these laws, the USSR State Bank will become the central bank of issue, and specialized state banks will turn into commercial banks. Converting them into joint stock banks is the most likely way to accomplish this.

[Unidentified participant] Is the rate of taxation of enterprise profits proposed by the government (55 percent) not too high? After all, this rate is much lower in developed market-economy countries.

[Abalkin] Let us examine this. When they refer to the 35-percent rate of taxation on the profits of American companies, they mean only the federal tax paid to federal authorities. In our draft, it comes to 30 percent. This is the segment of profits which is withheld for the USSR State Budget with a view to implementing centralized measures. A large segment of the remaining profits of concerns and corporations in, for example, the United States, likewise does not remain at their disposal but is distributed as dividends among the shareholders of these corporations. Only an insignificant segment of the profits, only 18 to 20 percent, remains at the disposal of concerns and corporations proper. In the draft law on the taxation of enterprises which is being prepared by the government this share comes to 45 percent.

Now, I will refer briefly to the ceiling of profitability. We are declaring profits of above 30 percent to be windfall profits. We should note that this is a quite high norm which is inconceivable for a capitalist concern. If our methods of calculating profits were to be used, its limit in Western countries would amount to 20 percent on the average.

[Unidentified participant] In your opinion, will a more extensive penetration of our market by foreign companies be helpful in combating the monopoly situation of individual enterprises?

[Abalkin] Undoubtedly, plugging vigorously into the economic relations of the world and creating competition will amount to a major antimonopoly measure.

USSR Minister of Finance V.S. Pavlov

[Unidentified participant] Will we succeed in keeping the budget deficit within the bounds set this year?

[Pavlov] The budget deficit in the first quarter of this year came to R15 billion, whereas the annual deficit confirmed by the USSR Supreme Soviet amounts to R60 billion. I would also like to invite your attention to the fact that for the first time in many years the investment of credit in the national economy, including loans to cover the budget deficit, declined, the budget deficit being what it is.

[Unidentified participant] Why are capital investments being reduced so slowly? After all, the situation in capital construction keeps deteriorating?

[Pavlov] The plan for this year provides for reducing production capital investment. However, something else bothers me. They are being reduced at even a higher rate than planned. To my mind, given the existing degree of wear of the fixed assets in our national economy, this may bring about a considerable decline in our potential for improving the efficiency of production in the future. This is why reducing capital investment in production is good up to a certain level. "Cutting back" at present will result in tremendous problems and disproportions in the not-so-distant future.

[Unidentified participant] When grain prices go up the cost of mixed feed may increase and consequently the self-cost of meat will grow. Will this not bring about an increase in budgetary expenditures for subsidizing its production or an increase in retail prices?

[Pavlov] The price reform provides for a mutually coordinated revision of prices of a number of foodstuffs. You would understand that the prices of meat cannot be raised without changing fish or, say, egg prices, because in this case they will not be available for sale. As far as greater expenditures for fattening cattle are concerned, we should keep in mind the fact that mixed feed prices will remain as they were. This is why an increase in meat prices does not follow from an increase in grain prices.

[Unidentified participant] Will an increase in vodka prices bring about the growth of inflation and the greater incidence of moonshine production and speculation?

[Pavlov] These are justified apprehensions. This is something to think about.

[Unidentified participant] Are there going to be peculiarities in the taxation of construction, specifically, in taxes on construction within the framework of state orders and construction of housing and social facilities?

[Pavlov] We should note that tax relief is an important economic arrangement for giving incentives to accomplish priority socioeconomic tasks. Of course, it will be vigorously used by the state in a market economy, including in the case of building the most significant facilities of the national economy and the social sphere.

[Unidentified participant] Credit in our country is the cheapest in the world. What stands in the way of considerably increasing the interest rate on loans?

[Pavlov] This definitely needs to be done. However, it cannot be implemented immediately. Why? Everything is interconnected in the economy. If, having raised prices, we increase the interest rate on loans, this may unfavorably affect the enterprises which at present have a low profit margin or even operate at a loss through no fault of their own but due to prices for their products being based on the average prices in industry or even being below them. After all, it is common knowledge that such expenditures do not necessarily coincide with the estimated cost of the products manufactured. This is why we may do damage in cases when we should provide help.

[Unidentified participant] Is it expected to reinforce state control in the country in the course of switching to a market economy?

[Pavlov] Certainly, state control should be reinforced. In particular, tax inspectorates are being created now. In the process, the tax inspectorates are being given, for the first time, the right of access to bank documents for conducting reviews. Previously the finance organs did not have such a right. Besides, it is proposed to reorganize financial control. Thus, it is planned to create a chain of auditing companies for conducting audits in the national economy. These auditing companies are called upon to perform the functions which at present are performed by in-house financial control bodies reporting to the ministry. However, all of this certainly takes some time and, primarily, will require that proper skilled cadres be trained. We definitely intend to reinforce the control and auditing apparatus of the Ministry of Finance.

[Unidentified participant] When will the channeling of non-cash money into cash by cooperatives stop? Who profits by this?

[Pavlov] It is clear who profits. As far as the channeling of money is concerned, the government made a number of proposals for bringing the monetary circulation of cooperatives within the framework of the entire state in the course of developing additions to the Law on Cooperatives. It was proposed to set for them the same rules which exist for state enterprises and organizations. We hope that these proposals of the government will be accepted.

[Unidentified participant] How does the conversion of defense industries affect the condition of the budget?

[Pavlov] As of now, expenditures for conversion are to amount to about R5 billion this year. The results of conversion will come in the future in the form of growth in the production of consumer goods.

[Unidentified participant] What is going to happen to enterprises operating at a loss in the course of our transition to the market? Will they be liquidated?

[Pavlov] We should look on a case-by-case basis at every enterprise operating at a loss and the reasons for its lack of profitability. However, the problem of unprofitability cannot be solved given the existing prices. Of course, unprofitability and the market are incompatible. At any rate, it is proposed that the revenue of the budget due to the liquidation of unprofitable enterprises and their sale would come to R2 billion.

[Unidentified participant] What is the amount of nonrepayable aid given by the Soviet Union to socialist and developing countries? Would it not be better to invest this money in improving the standard of living of the Soviet people?

[Pavlov] Nonrepayable aid provided by our country this year will come to R2 billion. Deliveries of weapons account for 90 or more percent of it. It is clear that our domestic market will not be saturated with such merchandise. Perhaps, only if we start selling weapons inside the country....

[Unidentified participant] Data have been published in the press on the many billions owed by other countries to the Soviet Union. Why should we not collect on this debt since we have great difficulties with hard currency?

[Pavlov] Indeed. As of now, this debt comes to 80 billion. Some people are under the impression that this money can be collected right away. However, it was loaned. As is the case throughout the world, certain agreements were signed with regard to these loans which schedule the structure and deadlines for their repayment in individual years until 2005. This is why nobody will return it to us overnight, even if we want it very much.

This year, we should receive R3 billion as repayment for loans previously granted, and likewise in subsequent years. We settle with the countries which have extended loans to us in exactly the same manner. We should keep in mind the fact that this year we will receive from the socialist countries greater amounts than the ones we pay them.

[Unidentified participant] Will prices change for the goods in conjunction with which the notes of a state loan have now been issued?

[Pavlov] At present, the government is working on this issue. However, it is clear that the savings of the populace invested in the notes should not suffer. The issue can be resolved in two ways: Either the interest on these notes is increased, or old prices are maintained for specific types of products in conjunction with which the notes were issued. Everything depends on what goods these are.

V.I. Shcherbakov, chairman of the USSR Goskomtrud [State Committee for Labor and Social Problems]

[Unidentified participant] How are the sizes of wages going to be regulated in a market economy?

[Shcherbakov] A transition to a market economy should revive incentives for labor, increase "the price" of labor, and implement in reality the principle of distribution according to labor. We still live under a system in which few things are bought. For the most part, everything is allocated, and money itself is not worth much. In order to buy a car, furniture, a house, an apartment, and so on, one should make an effort to "arrange" for the goods, sneaking onto various kinds of lists, and so on rather than making money. Incentives for labor are also absent because the spread of salaries between highly skilled and unskilled, complicated and simple work is very small.

A lot has to be changed in the organization of the system of wages, primarily in the proportion of the measures of state regulation and the economic independence of labor collectives, in order to change this situation. The main task of the state is to ensure a correct ratio of the volume of funds allocated for personal consumption and the results of work of enterprises.

[Unidentified participant] Will tariffs remain or will they become unnecessary?

[Shcherbakov] In the new environment, the state should regulate only the minimum of wages and ensure the social security of the people from the point of view of subsistence income. Consequently, the role of the state tariff system will change. It will have to guarantee minimal wages for a certain volume of labor, to become its lowest boundary.

The forms and systems of remuneration, extra payments, bonuses, and allowances will be set by the enterprises on their own. In this matter, the state may only voice its recommendations and wishes.

[Unidentified participant] Will the role of personal income of the working people increase in the environment of the market? Or will payments from public consumption funds be more important?

[Shcherbakov] In my opinion, the standard of living of the able-bodied populace should increase at the expense of the more vigorous utilization of the results of one's labor. Social norms which determine the amount of benefits provided free of charge should be introduced in our planning practices. The population should buy everything that comes on top of the standard, usual level of such social benefits. Understandably, this approach will be accompanied by special measures aimed at reinforcing the social security of the people. At issue are primarily the handicapped, young people, single mothers, and so on. Such measures are envisaged by the program of a transition to the market submitted by the government.

[Unidentified participant] What is the difference in principle between approaches to evaluating labor in our country and in the West?

[Shcherbakov] The high "price" of labor and the high cost of maintaining workers compel entrepreneurs in the West to treat technical progress in a very different manner. In our country, we still take into account meeting mainly the current expenses of a worker for food, a small amount of manufactured consumer goods, very cheap housing, and so on in setting the level of wages. However, the low "price" of labor simultaneously makes it unprofitable for us to carry out measures aimed at improving conditions on the job and introducing new equipment and technologies, which affects scientific-technical progress substantially. This explains to a great degree the fact that labor organization in our country is at an extremely low level, and the loss of work time reaches up to 30 percent. This situation needs to be changed.

[Unidentified participant] Some economists propose to switch to the market by means of "shock treatment." How does the government view the social consequences of such a step?

[Shcherbakov] The method of "shock treatment" produces rapid results in the economy, and from this point of view it is attractive. However, its social consequences are extremely painful. First of all, the very rapid, uncontrollable growth of prices of consumer goods would begin. As the experience of the world shows, nobody would be in a position to cushion it, including the use of traditional methods such as indexing the incomes of the population. Naturally, the living standard of the population would begin to decline precipitously. Given the rapid growth of prices, many enterprises, especially those with low profit margins and those operating at a loss, would not be in a position to withstand competition and would go under. Mainly, these would be industries producing goods for the populace and rendering services (in essence, all enterprises of the agroindustrial complex, light industry, services, communal facilities, and so on). Besides, many people would lose jobs and, consequently, incomes (according to forecasts, between 15 and 18 percent of the workers in the production branches).

In the opinion of the government, the method of a regulated transition to the market in the course of which a system of social security for the populace is enacted simultaneously with market factors is more acceptable.

[Unidentified participant] To your mind, how effective is the proposed system of social security of the populace in the environment of our transition to the market?

[Shcherbakov] First of all, protection of the populace in the course of a one-time revision of prices will be ensured. As is known, it is planned to return to the populace the entire amount of funds generated by the one-time revision of prices with the exception of amounts due to increasing the prices of gold and jewelry, a number of high-cost items (cars and so on), as well as wine and vodka products and certain gourmet foods. This was discussed in a quite detailed manner in the concept of the government.

At the same time, in the opinion of the Goskomtrud, the income base of the population should be equalized before switching to a new price level. As is known, the introduction of new terms for labor compensation in productive branches was essentially completed in 1987 through 1990. Their introduction in nonproductive sectors has merely begun, and it was planned to complete this measure in 1993. We think that this deadline needs to be brought forward, and new terms for labor remuneration need to be introduced in the non-productive sectors as soon as this year.

Social protection of the low-income strata of the populace is a special issue. A number of decisions have already been made in this matter. Thus, payments to women on maternity leave, single mothers, and the wives of soldiers in basic service will be increased effective 1 January 1991. An allowance equal to the minimum wage has been introduced for them. Besides, retirement benefits and the scholarships of students in secondary and higher educational establishments are going up. However, there is still one more category of the low-income populace left for whom the level of benefits has not been revised for several decades. We think that the funds which the state will receive due to increasing the prices of jewelry, wine and vodka products, and gourmet foods should be allocated primarily for this category of the populace.

[Unidentified participant] What does the so-called "consumer basket" represent?

[Shcherbakov] Naturally in the environment of a market economy prices will change, and primarily upward. The government proposes to use the following procedure in order to compensate the populace for the losses associated with the growth of prices: to establish legislatively a "consumer basket" in our country which includes a certain set of foodstuffs, manufactured goods, and services, study every quarter the movement of prices for goods in this "basket," determine the indexes of price movement, and index the incomes of the population accordingly. The rate of indexing should differ by stratum of the population. In our opinion, those who cannot work fully and thus compensate for the increasing cost of living on their own should receive full compensation. These are families with many children, retirees, young people receiving education, the handicapped, and so on. The able-bodied population should compensate for some of the inflation by increasing its labor input. In this sense, inflation should be an additional factor in increasing production and the efficiency of labor.

[Unidentified participant] Unemployment is apparently unavoidable in the environment of a market economy. Is social security envisaged for people who are temporarily left without a job?

[Shcherbakov] First of all, it is planned to give to local soviets the right to set quotas of social employment at all enterprises regardless of their institutional affiliation. These are quotas of jobs for young people, single mothers, the handicapped, and so on. A failure to meet these quotas should expose the enterprises to serious economic sanctions, the proceeds of which should make it possible to develop a system of jobs for such people at other enterprises.

Besides, it is necessary to set up an extensive state employment service which would provide vocational guidance, training, and retraining for the populace, and reeducation of cadres, improvement of their skills, and job placement. If an appropriate job cannot be found for an individual right away, an unemployment benefit should be paid to him. Such measures are envisaged by the draft Law "On Employment" which is now being considered by the USSR Council of Ministers.

Regarding possible unemployment, we should keep in mind the fact that we have substantial reserves of jobs, although we do expect the release of labor primarily from productive sectors. At present, there are 2.8 million vacant jobs. Almost 7 million jobs on the second and third shifts go unfilled. This is why the issue is to bring the structure of the work force in line with the needs of production. It is exactly this work that the state employment service being created in the Goskomtrud organization should do.

Gorbachev Aide on Move to Market Economy

PM2006081090 Copenhagen DET FRI AKTUELT in Danish 15 Jun 90 p 18

[Report on undated interview with Nikolay Petrakov, economic adviser to Mikhail Gorbachev, by Jorgen Flindt Pedersen: "Petrakov's Plan"]

[Text] Moscow—Nikolay Petrakov is an influential man in the Soviet Union: an economist whom President Gorbachev brought in from outside as his personal adviser and whom he is said to heed more than the conservatives in the party apparatus.

And Petrakov believes that he has the plan which can transform the stagnating state socialist society into a modern market economy—without things ending in panic, as they did recently when the citizens of Moscow and Leningrad ran amok and began hoarding madly out of fear of the government's proposed price rises.

In an exclusive interview with DET FRI AKTUELT at his office in the Central Committee building just outside the walls of the Kremlin Petrakov said:

"We are in the process of resolving a world-scale problem. No other society has ever had to reorganize itself on such a scale from a command economy to a market economy. As Gorbachev has said, this can be likened to the October Revolution in 1917. That was when we began to destroy the market—and that was something we were good at."

[Flindt Pedersen] How should we understand that?

[Petrakov] People have a totally wrong view of what a free market means. For many years the economic officials scared them by telling them how frightful things were under capitalism. They told them that free market forces automatically led to poverty, hunger, and unemployment. It was an outright economic crusade, but it did not hold water when compared with reality—and all ideology perishes when people see the real truth. And they did so increasingly through the mass media and travels abroad.

[Flindt Pedersen] But isn't there already a market in the Soviet Union—the black market?

[Petrakov] Yes, and that is another problem. On the black market goods are much more expensive. So people think that a market economy means very expensive goods—which are not for ordinary people. But the black market is not free. On the contrary it is characterized by monopolies and shortages. That is why we have the high prices.

So the first step toward a free market must be to create competition, abolish the monopolies. In heavy industry we must do so through joint stock companies which must work according to market conditions, even though the state holds the majority. In addition there must be a host of smaller private companies.

[Flindt Pedersen] Completely private?

[Petrakov] Yes, family-owned or cooperatives—it is not important. And the state should help them with credit and favorable support arrangements. The problem is that very few people today have the means to invest. We only earn our salaries. And people from the black market have difficulty laundering their money.

At the same time we have to reform the money system, which does not work at all. Today the banks are subordinate to the government. This means that the bank director cannot say "no" when the government asks for money for a project. But the person who uses the money should not also be able to print it. This is like counterfeiting. And to a certain extent our money is counterfeit, because it cannot be used on the international market. You can compare the ruble with a lottery ticket. You need a great deal of luck to get anything out of it.

[Flindt Pedersen] How does this manifest itself?

[Petrakov] Well, in Moscow it is not enough to have money: You also have to be able to prove that you live there. There are stores where people show a new marriage certificate in order to be allowed to buy goods. Also, many enterprises have a system of goods ordered in advance which never find their way onto the ordinary market. And then there are lots of stores where it is only possible to buy for hard currency.

[Flindt Pedersen] The government's economic reforms have been criticized as being too little too late. Some people take the view that you should have done what the Poles have done and adopted a shock cure with free pricing immediately.

[Petrakov] I agree with the criticism. They were only controlled price rises and had nothing to do with market economy. I can tell you quite openly that I have also said this in the Soviet media. My situation is complicated by the fact that everyone thinks that every time I speak, what I say is the president's view. I speak only for myself.

[Flindt Pedersen] So what should President Gorbachev do?

[Petrakov] In a speech last Monday he made it possible for the government to be given a breathing space until 1 September, but this should not, and will not, prevent him from doing what is necessary before then in decrees. Getting things moving is an urgent task.

[Flindt Pedersen] So what concrete things should now be done?

[Petrakov] My program looks like this: a decree on joint stock companies, a decree on small private enterprises, a decree on a banking reform, a decree on major cuts in the state budget.

These things should all be done this summer. Once they have been done and demonopolization is in motion, I would then declare prices free. But at the same time we must take account of people's psychology: That is why there must be controls over certain basic goods. For example, we should maintain the same price for the type of bread that is most in demand today, but derestrict prices for all other types of bread and cake.

The same with meat. There is a particular sort of frozen meat with a high fat content. Here we should keep the price as it is today, but otherwise free all other meat prices. Unlike the government's plan, this would not mean that we would need to give a wage supplement, for the worst off could choose to buy the cheap goods.

I also think that we could create a type of people's restaurant with very cheap meals for pensioners, invalids, war veterans, and those with the lowest wages. That is better than giving a pensioner an additional R30 to 40 per month. She would only spend it on a new bicycle for her grandchild. In this way we can accustom people to free prices.

[Flindt Pedersen] Collective ownership—will you also deal with that once and for all?

[Petrakov] We should begin by introducing legal equality between private property and other forms of property. Our legislation discriminates against private property. And that is completely illogical. This, because if we think that collective ownership is superior to private ownership and will emerge victorious from competition with all other forms of ownership, we do not need to give it legal preference.

We have been given the impression that joint stock companies are always owned by Rockefeller types. But in reality the joint stock company makes it possible for ordinary people to become co-owners. Here in the Soviet Union it is most often the ministries which own enterprises. Thus it is not the people, but a few government offices that are owners today. They are not at all responsible for results. This, because an official receives the same salary even if he makes an idiot of himself vis-a-vis the enterprise over which he has influence.

[Flindt Pedersen] How will your society look when we reach the year 2000?

[Petrakov] It will be a democratic humanist society.

[Flindt Pedersen] Did you say "communist" or "humanist?"

[Petrakov] Humanist. I did not say "communist." It will be a union of sovereign republics, based on an agreement on common defenses and a common foreign policy, on the defense of citizens' rights, and a common market. And it will be a society whose economy will be completely integrated with the economy of the rest of the world.

Ryzhkov Signs Temporary Rules for Shareholders

LD1906224790 Moscow World Service in English 1500 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] The Soviet prime minister, Nikolay Ryzhkov, has signed an act on the temporary rules of setting up shareholders societies and issuing securities. His deputy, Dr. Leonid Abalkin, has said as much in an interview with Radio Moscow. The act can be viewed as a step towards market economy in this country. The sphere is to be regulated by a special legislation in time.

USSR Law on Enterprises Published

904A0424A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 pp 1-2

[USSR Law: "On Enterprises in the USSR"]

[Text] The present law determines the general legal, economic, and social principles for the organization of an enterprise with a diversity of forms of ownership and its activity under the conditions of the development of commodity-monetary relations and a regulated market.

The law is directed toward providing for the independence of the enterprise, it determines the enterprise's rights and responsibilities in carrying out its economic activity, and it regulates the enterprise's relations with other enterprises and organizations, soviets of people's

deputies, and state administrative organs, and it works in conjunction with other laws of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

SECTION I. General Provisions

Article 1. The Enterprise and Its Main Tasks

1. An enterprise is an economically operating subject with the rights of a corporate person which, on the basis of the utilization of property by the labor collective, produces and sells products, performs work, and renders services. The enterprise does not contain other corporate bodies.

The enterprise operates on principles of economic accountability regardless of the forms of ownership of the means of production and other property.

2. The main tasks of the enterprise are to satisfy public needs for its products, work, and services, and, with the profit received, to satisfy the economic and social interests of members of the labor collective and the interests of the owner of the enterprise's property.

3. An enterprise may carry out any kind of economic activity that is not prohibited by the legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics and corresponds to the goals envisioned by the enterprise charter.

Certain kinds of activity, a list of which is determined by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, may be engaged in by the enterprise only on the basis of special permission (license).

Article 2. Kinds of Enterprises

1. In keeping with the forms of ownership established by the USSR Law "On Property in the USSR," the following kinds of enterprises may operate:

based on ownership by Soviet citizens—individual or family enterprises;

based on collective ownership—collective enterprise; production cooperative, the enterprise belonging to the cooperative; the enterprise created in the form of a joint stock company or other business company or partnership or belonging to this company or partnership; an enterprise of a public organization; an enterprise of a religious organization;

based on state ownership—state union enterprise; state republic enterprise (of a union republic); state enterprise of an autonomous republic, autonomous oblast, autonomous okrug; state municipal enterprise.

2. A joint enterprise is created on the basis of pooling the property of its founders who have the rights of a corporate body. In keeping with legislation of the USSR the founders may include foreign corporate bodies and citizens.

3. In keeping with the volume of economic circulation of the enterprise and the number of its workers, regardless of the forms of ownership, it may be included among small enterprises, with the peculiarities of their creation and activity and also the policy for including them with one kind or another being established by USSR legislation.

4. Other kinds of enterprises may operate in the USSR, including leasing if their creation does not contradict the legislative acts of the USSR.

Article 3. Associations of Enterprises

1. Enterprises may join together on a voluntary basis into unions, economic associations, concerns, and other associations according to branch, territorial, or other principles for purposes of coordinating their activity, providing for protection of their rights, and representing their common interests in the corresponding state and other organs and also in international organizations. By a coordinated decision of the enterprises the association may be made responsible for centralized performance of certain production- economic and other functions.

These structures are created taking into account the antimonopoly requirements established by the corresponding legislative acts of the USSR and union republics.

The association may operate on the basis of a charter approved by its founders. Enterprises included in these organizational structures retain their independence and the rights of a corporate body, and the effect of the present law extends to them.

2. An association is registered according to the procedure established by the present law for the enterprise. An association is a corporate body and has independent and consolidated balances, a current and other accounts in banking institutions, and a seal with its name.

3. The association is not responsible for the obligations of the enterprise included in it and the enterprises are not responsible for the obligations of the association unless otherwise stipulated by the charter agreement (charter).

4. Enterprises included in an association have the right to withdraw from it while retaining their commitments to the other enterprises in the association in keeping with agreements that have been concluded.

5. An association is liquidated by a decision of the enterprises included in it. The liquidation of the association is carried out according to the procedure established for the liquidation of an enterprise. The property remaining after the liquidation of an association is distributed among the participants in keeping with the charter of the association.

Article 4. Legislation on the Enterprise

1. State enterprises are guided by the present law and other legislative documents of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, and enterprises with other forms of property are guided by the present law and other legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics, and in cases stipulated by these acts—also by decrees of the USSR Council of Ministers and the councils of ministers of the union and autonomous republics.

2. The peculiarities of the application of the present law for individual kinds of state union enterprises whose activity involves greater requirements for organization and safety of work and continuity of the technological process and also is conditioned by the need for centralization of the functions of management and the list of these kinds of enterprises are determined by the USSR Council of Ministers.

3. The peculiarities of the creation and operation of joint enterprises with the participation of Soviet corporate bodies and foreign corporate bodies and citizens are established by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

SECTION II. The Creation of the Enterprise and the Procedure for Its Registration

Article 5. General Conditions for the Creation of an Enterprise

1. An enterprise may be created either by a decision of the owner (owners) of property or an organ, enterprise, or organization authorized by him (them), or by a decision of the labor collective in cases and according to the procedure envisioned by the present law and other legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

2. An enterprise may be created as a result of separation from existing enterprises and the organization of one or several structural subdivisions on the initiative of the collective of workers of the given subdivision (subdivisions) if the owner of the property of the enterprise (his authorized organ, enterprise, or organization) agrees to this and the contractual commitments made previously by the enterprise are met.

3. An enterprise may be created on the basis of a structural unit of the association by a decision of the labor collective while the given structural unit retains its obligations to the association.

4. In cases where a plot of land or other natural resources are required for the creation and operation of the enterprise, permission for their use is granted by the corresponding soviet of people's deputies, and in cases envisioned by legislative acts, by the primary user of the natural resources when there is a favorable conclusion from the corresponding expert evaluation. A refusal to grant a plot of land or other natural resources may be appealed according to the procedure envisioned by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

5. An enterprise is considered created and it acquires the rights of a corporate body beginning on the day of its state registration.

Article 6. State Registration of an Enterprise

1. State registration of an enterprise is carried out in the executive committee of the rayon, city, or rayon-in-city soviet of people's deputies in the place where the enterprise is located unless otherwise stipulated by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics.

The information for state registration of an enterprise is reported within 10 days to the USSR Ministry of Finance to be included in the Uniform State Register.

2. For state registration of the enterprise in the executive committee of the corresponding soviet of people's deputies one submits the decision for its creation, its charter, and other documents included on a list determined by the USSR Council of Ministers.

State registration of an enterprise must be carried out no later than 30 days from the time of submission of the application with the necessary documents appended to the executive committee of the corresponding soviet of people's deputies.

3. A rejection of state registration of an enterprise may follow because of violation of the procedure established by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics for the creation of an enterprise and also a failure of the charter act (documents) to meet the requirements of legislation. Registration of a state enterprise may not be refused because its creation is inexpedient.

If a state enterprise is not registered within the established time period or it is refused because of reasons which the founder of the enterprise considers unjustified, it may take the matter to court.

4. For state registration of the enterprise payment is collected from it in amounts established by legislation of the union and autonomous republics. The funds to be obtained are transferred by the executive committee of the soviet of people's deputies into the budget of the rayon, city, or rayon-in-city in the place where the enterprise is registered.

Article 7. The Creation of Branch Enterprises and Special Subdivisions of an Enterprise

1. The enterprise has the right to create branch enterprises with the rights of a corporate body and also branches, representative bodies, divisions, and other special subdivisions with the right to open current and running accounts and approve provisions concerning them.

2. Coordination of the question of the distribution of these enterprises and subdivisions with the corresponding local soviets of people's deputies is carried out according to the procedure established for the creation of the enterprise.

Article 8. Licensing Kinds of Activity

In order to conduct the kinds of activity that require licensing the enterprise must obtain the necessary license according to the procedure established by the USSR Council of Ministers and the councils of ministers of the union and autonomous republics.

Article 9. The Charter of the Enterprise

1. The enterprise operates on the basis of a charter. The charter is approved by the founder (founders) of the enterprise.

2. The charter of the enterprise determines: the name of the enterprise, its location, the object and goal of its activity, its management and control organs, their competence, the procedure for the formation of the property of the enterprise and the distribution of its profits (revenues), and the conditions for the reorganization and termination of the activity of the enterprise.

The charter may also include other provisions that do not contradict legislation and are related to the peculiarities of the enterprise's activity.

SECTION III. The Property of the Enterprise

Article 10. Conditions for the Formation and Utilization of Property

1. The enterprise's property is comprised of fixed and circulating capital and also other values whose worth is reflected in the independent balance of the enterprise.

2. The enterprise's property, in keeping with legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics and with the charter of the enterprise, may belong to it as property or with full management.

3. The sources of the formation of the enterprise's property are:

monetary and material contributions of the founders;

revenues received from the sale of products, work, services, and also other kinds of economic activity;

revenues from securities;

credit from banks and other creditors;

capital investments and budget subsidies;

nonreimbursable or philanthropic contributions, donations from organizations, enterprises, and citizens;

other sources not prohibited by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

4. The enterprise has the right to sell and transfer to other enterprises, organizations, and institutions, to exchange, lease, or turn over for temporary use free of charge or in trade its buildings, structures, equipment, means of transportation, supplies, raw material, and other material values and also to write them off the books unless otherwise stipulated by legislative acts of the USSR and the union and autonomous republics or the enterprise's charter.

5. The enterprise has the right, unless otherwise stipulated by the charter, to sell or lease to citizens means of production and other material values with the exception of those which, in keeping with the legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, may not be used or owned by them. The enterprise may transfer free of charge and provide material values to citizens with the permission of the owner or an organ authorized by him in cases not prohibited by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 11. Possession and Use of Natural Resources.

1. The enterprise possesses and uses land and other natural resources under the established policy for payment and—in cases stipulated by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics—under preferential conditions or free of charge.

2. The enterprise must promptly take environmental protection measures directed toward reducing and compensating for the negative effects of its production on the environment. These measures may be financed with its own funds or from other sources.

In keeping with legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics the enterprise bears responsibility for observance of the requirements and norms for efficient utilization, restoration, and protection of land, water, minerals, forests, and other natural resources, and it also makes reimbursement for damage resulting from its activity.

Article 12. Attraction by the Enterprise of Capital from Corporate Bodies and Citizens

1. In order to attract additional monetary funds for purposes of expansion and improvement of production and social development of the labor collectives, the enterprise has the right to issue and sell securities.

2. The procedure for the enterprise to issue and sell securities, the kinds of them, and the rights of the holders are determined by legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 13. Guarantees of the Property Rights of the Enterprise

The state guarantees protection of the property rights of the enterprise and the state is not allowed to confiscate from the enterprise its fixed capital, circulating capital, or much of the property it uses, with the exception of

cases envisioned by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Losses caused to the enterprise as a result of violation of its property rights by citizens, corporate bodies, and state organs are reimbursed to the enterprise by a decision of the court or the state arbitration board.

SECTION IV. Management of the Enterprise and Self-Management

Article 14. General Principles for the Organization of Management of the Enterprise and Self-Management

1. The administration of the enterprise is carried out in keeping with its charter on the basis of a combination of principles of self-management of the labor collective and the rights of the owner to economic use of his property. The enterprise determines the structure of management and establishes the staff.

The owner exercises his rights to manage the enterprise directly or through an organ authorized by him. The owner or his authorized organ may delegate their rights to an enterprise council (board) or other organ envisioned by the charter of the enterprise which represents the interests of the owner and the labor collective.

2. Hiring (appointing, selecting) the manager of the enterprise is the right of the owner of the property of the enterprise and is exercised by him directly and also through organs authorized by him or through councils of the enterprise, boards, or other organs to which are delegated the right to manage the enterprise.

3. Decisions about socioeconomic problems pertaining to the activity of the enterprise are developed and applied by its management organs with the participation of the labor collective and organs authorized by it.

Article 15. The Labor Collective of the Enterprise, Its Authority

1. The labor collective of the enterprise is comprised of all citizens participating through their labor in its activity on the basis of a labor contract (agreement, understanding) and also other forms regulating labor relations between the worker and the enterprise.

2. The basic form in which the labor collective of the enterprise exercises its authority is the general meeting (conference).

Article 16. The General Meeting (Conference) of the Labor Collective of the Enterprise

The general meeting (conference) of the labor collective of the enterprise:

resolves questions related to the purchase of property by the enterprise;

resolves the question of the need to conclude with the enterprise administration a collective contract (agreement), considers the draft of it and authorizes the trade union committee or other organs to sign it on its behalf;

elects (recalls) representatives to the enterprise council and hears reports on their activity;

if necessary, may form a council of the labor collective and determine its functions.

Article 17. The Collective Contract (Agreement)

The collective contract (agreement) may be concluded at all kinds of enterprises and must not contradict existing legislation of the USSR.

The collective contract (agreement) regulates production and labor relations at the enterprise, and questions of labor protection, the social development of the collective, and the health of its members.

When there are differences of opinion during the conclusion or execution of a collective contract (agreement) they are resolved according to a procedure established by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 18. The Enterprise Council (Board)

1. The council (board) of the enterprise consists of an equal number of representatives appointed by the owner of the property of the enterprise and elected by its labor collective unless otherwise stipulated by the charter of the enterprise.

2. The number of members of the enterprise council is determined by the enterprise charter. The enterprise council is formed for a period stipulated in the enterprise charter.

3. Members of the enterprise council elected from the labor collective may not be fired during their term of office (on the initiative of the administration) from the enterprise or have their position (salary) lowered or be transferred to lower-paid work without the agreement of the general meeting (conference) of the labor collective that elected them.

4. The enterprise council: determines the general direction of the economic and social development of the enterprise; determines the procedure for distributing net profit; at the request of the manager of the enterprise, makes a decision to issue securities of the enterprise and also to purchase securities of the enterprises and organizations; resolves questions of creating subsidiary enterprises and creating and terminating the activity of other separate subdivisions of the enterprise and the entry or withdrawal of the enterprise into associations; makes decisions pertaining to the enterprise's foreign economic activity; considers conflicts arising between the enterprise administration and the labor collective and takes measures to resolve them; resolves other issues envisioned by the enterprise charter.

The enterprise council resolves issues within its competence at its meetings. The council is not allowed to intervene in the operational and managerial activity the administration.

The rules for the adoption of decisions by the enterprise council are regulated by the enterprise charter.

5. The chairman of the enterprise council is elected at a meeting of the enterprise council by open or secret voting from among its members.

Article 19. The Enterprise Manager

1. When hiring (appointing, electing) an enterprise manager to the position, a contract (agreement, understanding) is concluded with him which determines the rights, duties, and responsibilities of the enterprise leader and the conditions for his material support and release from the position he holds, taking into account the guarantees envisioned by existing legislation.

2. The enterprise manager independently resolves all issues related to the activity of the enterprise with the exception of those included by the present law in the competence of the general meeting (conference) of the labor collective and the enterprise council.

The enterprise manager acts without a power of attorney on behalf of the enterprise and represents its interests in all domestic and foreign enterprises, firms, and organizations, disposes of the property of the enterprise, concludes contracts, including labor contracts, issues powers of attorney, opens current and other accounts in banks, has the right to dispose of capital, approves the staff of the executive apparatus of the board of directors, and issues orders that are mandatory for all workers of the enterprise.

3. The enterprise manager may be discharged from the position he holds before the contract expires for reasons stipulated in the contract or existing legislation.

Article 20. The Deputy Manager of the Enterprise and Managers of Its Structural Subdivisions

1. Deputy managers of the enterprise and managers of subdivisions of the administrative apparatus and structural subdivisions (productions, shops, departments, divisions, sections, farms, and other analogous subdivisions of the enterprise or structural unit of the association) and also foremen and senior foremen are hired and fired by the enterprise manager.

2. Brigade leaders are elected at meetings of the collectives of brigades (by secret or open voting) and are approved by the manager of the subdivision of which the brigade is a part.

3. Decisions of deputies managers of the enterprise and managers of structural subdivisions are mandatory for all of their subordinates.

4. In certain cases related to the specific nature of the enterprise the enterprise charter may envision a different procedure for appointing deputy managers of enterprises, managers of its structural subdivisions, and brigade leaders.

SECTION V. The Managerial, Economic, and Social Activity of the Enterprise

Article 21. The Profit of the Enterprise

1. At all kinds of enterprises the main generalizing indicator of the financial results of economic activity is profit.

2. Profit remaining with the enterprise after paying taxes and making other material payments into the budget (net profit) is completely at its disposal. The enterprise determines independently the areas for using the net profit unless otherwise stipulated by the charter.

State influence on the selection of uses for net profit is exercised through taxes, tax breaks, and also economic sanctions.

3. In cases envisioned by legislation of the USSR or the enterprise charter, some of the net profit is turned over to members of the labor collective of the enterprise. The amount of this profit and the procedure for its distribution are determined by the council (board) of the enterprise.

The sum of profit belonging to the member of the labor collective forms his investment. The member of the labor collective may be issued shares for the amount of his investment. The enterprise annually pays the member of the labor collective interest (dividends) in amounts and according to the procedure determined by the charter.

A member of the labor collective has the right to obtain the sum of his investment (value of shares) according to the procedure and within the time periods determined in keeping with the charter.

Article 22. Labor Incomes of the Enterprise Worker

1. The labor incomes of each worker, regardless of the type of enterprise, are determined by his personal labor investment, taking into account the final results of the operation of the enterprise, they are regulated by taxes, and the maximum amount is not set.

2. The minimum amount of wages for workers of all kinds of enterprises is determined by USSR legislative acts.

3. The forms, systems, and amounts of wages and also other kinds of incomes of the workers are established by the enterprise independently.

Enterprises may utilize state wage rates and salaries as reference points for differentiation of wages depending on the occupation and skills of the workers and the difficulty and conditions of the work they perform.

Article 23. Planning the Activity of the Enterprise

1. The enterprise independently plans its own activity and determines the prospects for development based on the demand for the products, work, or services it provides and the need for ensuring the production and social development of the enterprise and increasing the personal incomes of its workers.

The plans are based on the contracts concluded with the consumers (buyers) of the products, work, services and the suppliers of material and technical resources.

2. The enterprise provides work and deliveries for state needs on a contractual basis according to a procedure determined by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

3. When preparing plans the enterprise coordinates with the corresponding soviet of people's deputies measures which could have ecological, social, demographic, or other consequences affecting the interests of the population on the territory.

Article 24. Economic Relations of the Enterprise With Other Enterprises, Organizations, and Citizens

1. The enterprise's relations with other enterprises, organizations, and citizens in all spheres of economic activity are arranged on the basis of a contract.

Enterprises are free in their choice of the subject of the contract, the determination of the obligations, and any other conditions of economic relations that do not contradict legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. The list of kinds of products, work, and services whose free sale is prohibited or limited is established by legislation of the USSR.

3. In its activity the enterprise takes into account the consumer's interests and requirement for quality of the products, work, or services.

The interests and rights of the consumer are protected by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 25. Material and Technical Support

1. The enterprise, on the basis of a study of market conditions, the capabilities of potential partners, and information about the movement of prices, organizes material and technical support for its own production and capital construction through the acquisition of resources on the goods and services market.

2. Resources are acquired on the goods and services market by the enterprise directly from the producers, in wholesale trade, including at trade fairs, at auctions, and in material and technical supply organizations, and also from other brokerage organizations.

Article 26. Prices and Price Setting

1. The enterprise sells its products, work, services, and production byproducts at prices and rates established independently or on a contractual basis, and in cases envisioned by legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics, at state prices.

2. For products of enterprises that hold monopolies on the goods market and also resources that determine the scale of prices in the economy and the social protection of the citizens, state regulation of prices is allowed.

In the event that the enterprise violates state discipline for prices and rates for products, work, and services, the surplus sum acquired is subject to confiscation. Moreover, the enterprise is fined according to the procedure and in the amounts established by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

Article 27. Financial and Credit Relations

1. The sources of the formation of financial resources of the enterprise are profit, amortization deductions, capital obtained from the sale of securities, shares and other investments of members of the labor collective, enterprises, organizations, and citizens, and also other revenues.

2. The enterprise uses bank credit on a commercial contractual basis.

3. The enterprise has the right to open running and other accounts in any bank for keeping monetary funds and carrying out all kinds of accounting, credit, and cash operations in the location where the enterprise is registered or in any other bank—with the agreement of the latter.

4. All accounts of the enterprise, including payments into the budget and payment of wages, are settled in the chronological order of the receipt of the account documents (due dates of payments). The accounts of enterprises for their commitments to other enterprises are settled, as a rule, in non-cash form through bank institutions. Cash accounts with citizens and enterprise are settled in keeping with the rules for conducting accounting and cash operations approved by the USSR Gosbank [State Bank].

5. The enterprise may deliver products, perform work, and render services on credit with payment by the buyers (consumers) of interest for temporary use of funds. In order to document these trade transactions the enterprise may use promissory notes in economic circulation.

6. The enterprise bears full responsibility for observance of credit contracts and accounting discipline. An enterprise that regularly fails to fulfill its commitments on accounts may be declared insolvent by the bank. Measures of influence and the procedure for their application against such enterprises are determined by the banks in keeping with legislative acts of the USSR.

Article 28. Foreign Economic Activity of the Enterprise

1. The enterprise has the right to carry out foreign economic activity independently in keeping with legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. Hard currency revenues are deposited in the bank account of the enterprise and used by it independently. Hard currency deductions into the union, republic, and local budgets are made from the hard currency revenues of the enterprise after subtracting direct currency expenditures made by the given enterprise from its own hard currency funds.

3. The rates of deductions into the Union, republic, and local budgets are regulated by legislative acts of the USSR.

Other withdrawals of hard currency funds from the enterprise are prohibited.

Article 29. The Social Activity of the Enterprise

1. Questions of social development, including improvement of the conditions for labor, life, and health, guarantees of mandatory medical insurance for members of the labor collective and their families, are resolved by the labor collective with the participation of the enterprise administration in keeping with legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. The enterprise must provide safe working conditions for all workers at the enterprise and is responsible under the policy established by legislation for harm to their health and their ability to work.

3. Pensioners who worked at the enterprise before going on a pension enjoy, on an equal basis with the workers, the opportunities at the enterprise for medical service, housing, and passes to health and treatment facilities, and also, by a decision of the general meeting (conference) of the collective—other social services and benefits.

4. The enterprise must constantly improve the conditions for the labor and life of women, provide work mainly during the day with a reduced work day for women who have small children, transfer pregnant women to lighter work with safe working conditions, and also offer women the privileges envisioned by legislation. An enterprise with harmful working conditions, with the agreement of the labor collective, may create separate shops and sections in order to offer lighter work to women.

5. The labor collective independently establishes for its workers additional vacations, a shorter work day, and other social privileges within the framework of the earned funds designated for consumption.

6. The enterprise may provide material incentives for workers of medical, children's, educational, and sports institutions, public catering organizations, and organizations that serve the labor collective but are not a part of it.

7. The consideration and resolution of questions concerning requests and appeals of the citizens to the enterprise are the executive responsibility of the administration of the enterprise and must not be left up to the citizens themselves.

SECTION VI. The Enterprise and the State

Article 30. Guarantees of the Rights and Interests of the Enterprises

1. The state guarantees the observance of the rights and legitimate interests of the enterprise.

The enterprise in conducting its economic and other activity has the right on its own initiative to make any decisions that do not contradict legislation.

Interference with the economic and other activity of the enterprise on the part of state, social, or cooperative organs is not allowed unless it affects the rights of state organs to monitor the activity of enterprises, envisioned by legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

2. Union, republic, and local state and social organs and their officials when making decisions pertaining to enterprises and in their relations with them bear responsibility for observance of the provisions of the present law.

State organs and officials may give the enterprise instructions only in keeping with their competence established by legislation. In the event that a state or other organ publishes an act that is not within its competence or the requirements of legislation, the enterprise has the right to apply to the court or the State Arbitration Board to declare this act invalid.

Losses sustained by the enterprise as a result of following the instructions of state or other organs or their officials which violate the rights of the enterprise and also because of improper performance by these organs or their officials of their duties with respect to the enterprise are subject to reimbursement by these organs. Disputes concerning reimbursement for losses are resolved by the court or the State Arbitration Board in keeping with their competence.

Article 31. Legal and Economic Conditions for the Economic Activity of the Enterprise

1. The state provides equal legal and economic conditions for the enterprise regardless of the form of ownership.

2. The state contributes to the development of the market by providing regulation with the help of economic levers and incentives, implements antitrust measures, and provides for social protection of all workers.

The state creates preferential conditions for enterprises engaged in technical improvement of production and above all those that introduce discoveries, inventions, and efficiency proposals.

State management organs arrange their relations with the enterprise using economic levers—interest on investments and loans, revenues from securities, prices and taxes, tax breaks and economic sanctions, special-purpose subsidies, the currency exchange rate, norms for amortization deductions, and social, ecological, and other norms and normatives.

Article 32. Accounting and Accountability

1. The enterprise provides operational and bookkeeping accounting for the results of its work and keeps statistical reports.

2. The forms for state statistical reporting are established by state statistical organs and include only the factual data and also the recipients and dates for submitting them. It is prohibited to demand that the statistical reports be submitted in violation of the procedure established by the present law. Information not specified in state statistical reporting may be submitted by the enterprise on the basis of an agreement or at the request of organs that are given the right by legislation to monitor individual aspects of the enterprise's activity.

3. Disciplinary, material, or criminal liability as established by legislation falls upon enterprise officials for distortion of state reports.

Article 33. The Enterprise's Trade Secrets

1. The trade secret of an enterprise is understood as information that is not a state secret related to production, technological information, management, finances, and other activity of the enterprise, the divulging (conveying, leaking) of which could cause harm to its interests.

2. The composition and volume of information comprising a trade secret and the procedure for protecting it are determined by the manager of the enterprise.

The kinds of activity of enterprises about which there may be no trade secrets are determined by the USSR Council of Ministers in order to prevent the enterprise from concealing information about pollution of the environment and other negative activity which could cause harm to the society.

3. Liability for disclosing information that comprises a trade secret of the enterprise and violation of the procedure for protecting this information is established by legislative acts of the USSR.

Article 34. Liability of the Enterprise

1. For violation of contractual obligations of credit-accounting and tax discipline, requirements for product quality, and other rules for carrying out economic activity the enterprise bears full property liability envisioned by the USSR and Union and autonomous republics.

Payment of fines and penalties for violation of the condition of the contract and also reimbursement for losses does not release the enterprise from the fulfillment of commitments for the delivery of products, the performance of work, or the rendering of services without the consent of the consumer.

2. The enterprise must make reimbursement for damages caused by failure to meet the requirements for efficient use of land and other natural resources, protection of the environment from pollutants and other harmful effects, violation of production safety rules, sanitary-hygienic norms, and requirements for protection of the health of workers, population, and the consumers of the products, and it must also pay a fine in an amount established by legislation.

The activity of an enterprise that violates the established conditions for the utilization of nature may be halted in keeping with the procedure envisioned by legislative acts of the USSR and Union and autonomous republics until the violations are eliminated.

Article 35. Monitoring the Activity of the Enterprise

1. A comprehensive review of the financial and economic activity of the enterprise may be conducted on the initiative of the owner and no more frequently than once a year.

2. Taxation and other state organs on which legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics place responsibility for inspecting various aspects of the activity of the enterprise may conduct these inspections as the need arises and strictly within the limits of their competence. The enterprise has the right not to meet the requirements of these organs concerning issues that go beyond their competence and not to show them materials that do not pertain to the subject of monitoring.

3. All kinds of inspections and reviews should contribute to increasing the effectiveness of management and should not disturb the normal operation of the enterprise. The enterprise is notified of the results of reviews and inspections.

Article 36. The Relationship Between the Enterprise and State Management Organs and Local Soviets of People's Deputies

1. Relations between the enterprise and state management and local self-management organs are arranged in keeping with the present law and other legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics which establish the competence of these organs.

2. The enterprise has the right on a strictly voluntary basis to participate in the formation of non-budget special-purpose financial funds of the republics and local soviets of people's deputies.

3. The enterprise participates on a voluntary contractual basis in the work for comprehensive economic and social

development of the territory conducted by the soviet of people's deputies with funds from the local budget.

By a decision of the local soviet of people's deputies or the state organ, the enterprise must create with the funds from these organs special work places for individuals with limited disability.

4. Local soviets of people's deputies or other organs are not allowed to take away dwelling space constructed with enterprise funds without the consent of the enterprise labor collective.

SECTION VII. Liquidation and Reorganization of the Enterprise

Article 37. Conditions for Liquidation and Reorganization of the Enterprise

1. The liquidation and reorganization (merging, unification, separation, breaking off, transformation) of the enterprise takes place by a decision of the owner of its property or the organ authorized to create such enterprises or by a decision of the court or arbitration board. Reorganization of an enterprise which could cause ecological, social, demographic, or other consequences affecting the interests of the population of the territory must be coordinated with the corresponding soviet of people's deputies.

2. An enterprise is also liquidated in the following cases:

when it is declared bankrupt;

when a decision has been made to prohibit the activity of the enterprise because of failure to meet the conditions established by legislation and because it has not provided for the observance of these conditions or changed its type of activity within the time period stipulated by the decision;

when the charter documents for the creation of the enterprise have been declared invalid by the court;

for other reasons envisioned by legislative acts of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

3. Upon reorganization and liquidation of an enterprise the released workers are guaranteed observance of their rights and interests in keeping with legislation of the USSR and union and autonomous republics.

4. The enterprise is considered to be reorganized or liquidated from the time it is removed from the state register.

5. In the event that the enterprise merges with another enterprise all the property rights and responsibilities of each of them are transferred to the enterprise that appeared as a result of the merging.

When one enterprise joins another, all the property rights and responsibilities of the enterprise that has joined are transferred to the one it has joined.

6. In the event that an enterprise divides, in keeping with the corresponding parts of the act of division (balance), the property rights and responsibilities of the reorganized enterprise are transferred to the enterprise that appeared as a result of this division.

When one or several new enterprises break off from an enterprise, in keeping with the corresponding parts of the act of division (balance), the property rights and responsibilities of the reorganized enterprise are transferred to each of them.

7. When one enterprise is transformed into another, all the property rights and responsibilities of the former enterprise are transferred to the new enterprise.

Article 38. The Liquidation Commission

1. The liquidation of an enterprise is carried out by a liquidation commission formed by its own or an authorized organ, and in cases where the enterprise is bankrupt—by the court or arbitration board. By their decision, the liquidation may be carried out by the enterprise itself represented by its management organ.

The owner, the court (arbitration board), or the organ authorized to create the enterprise which has made the decision to liquidate the enterprise establishes the procedure and time periods for carrying out the liquidation and also the deadline for submission of claims from creditors, which can be no less than two months from the time of the declaration of the liquidation.

2. The liquidation commission or other organ carrying out liquidation of the enterprise places in the official press in the place where the enterprise is located a notification of its liquidation and the procedure and deadline for creditors to make their claims. In addition to this public announcement the liquidation commission (organ carrying out the liquidation) must work to collect the debts owed to the enterprise and reveal the claims of creditors, notifying the latter of the liquidation of the enterprise.

The liquidation commission (organ carrying out the liquidation) evaluates the available property of the liquidated enterprise and settles with creditors, draws up the liquidation balance, and submits it to the owner or organ that appointed the liquidation commission.

Article 39. Satisfaction of Claims of Creditors

1. Claims of creditors against a liquidated enterprise are satisfied from the property of this enterprise. The first to be satisfied are the debts to the budget and compensation is made for recultivation of the land used by the liquidated enterprise.

2. Claims discovered and submitted after the deadline established for their submission are satisfied from the property of the enterprise remaining after the satisfaction of the primary claims, the claims that have been discovered, and also the claims submitted by the established deadline.

3. Claims that are not satisfied because the amount of property is inadequate are considered to be canceled. Claims not recognized by the liquidation commission (organ carrying out the liquidation) are also considered canceled if the creditors, within a month of the time they received notification of complete or partial rejection of the claim, do not file suit in court or the State Arbitration Board for satisfaction of their demands.

4. Upon liquidation of an enterprise, time payments payable by this enterprise in conjunction with an injury or other damage to health or the death of a citizen are capitalized.

5. Upon liquidation of an enterprise the investment of a member of the labor collective is returned to him in monetary form or in securities after the satisfaction of the claims of the creditors.

6. The property remaining after the satisfaction of the claims of the creditors and members of the labor collective is used according to the instructions of the owner.

7. Upon reorganization of an enterprise its rights and responsibilities are passed on to its heirs.

[Signed] President of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, M. Gorbachev. Moscow, The Kremlin, 4 June 1990

Military

Construction Battalions 'Disgrace' of Soviet Army

PM1906114790 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 p 1

[A. Kraynin report: "Construction Battalions Soon To Be Demobilized?"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security Questions has adopted a decision on disbanding military construction units employed in the national economy.

This Supreme Soviet committee has stood out from the rest for a long time in its truly Olympian calm and silence. I do not know whether the recent decision on military construction workers has anything to do with the changing of the guard—Leonid Sharin now stands at the "helm of power" instead of Vladimir Lapygin—but the committee has come to life and is showing character.

It was not easy: The session itself was preceded by an extremely tough, two-hour discussion with representatives of the construction ministries, who both demanded and begged that the process of eliminating military construction detachments be stretched out over a period of five to 10 years. The committee took a different stand: It proposed eliminating all military construction detachments—some 330,000 personnel—in 1991.

In the end, after a report by Sergey Tsyplyayev, secretary of the committee and a USSR people's deputy from the Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League], a report by the main military prosecutor, and a speech by a representative of a committee of soldiers' mothers, the sides reached a compromise: to disband all military construction detachments working in the national economy by 1 January 1991, with the exception of those working under the USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and the Nuclear Industry, the USSR Ministry of Communications, the Special Construction Work Main Administration attached to the USSR Ministry of Installation and Special Construction Work, and the Ministry of Construction in the Eastern Regions of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]. They have been given another year. At present, the fate of military construction workers under Defense Ministry jurisdiction is unclear. The ministry leadership has been instructed to submit proposals by the end of the year on the procedure and timescale for disbanding military construction detachments and creating a new structure of construction organizations for the USSR Defense Ministry.

I do realize that an enormous distance lies between the committee decision and the corresponding USSR Supreme Soviet resolution. But the fact that the documents have been presented to the USSR president for examination inspires optimism.

Military construction detachments have long been the disgrace of our Army. It is paradoxical, but, until recently, no one was clearly aware that in the majority of cases the Defense Ministry has absolutely nothing to do with these filthy, unshaven young people in tattered uniforms.

Actually, we were all simply deceived for many years. Young people drafted into the Army were herded off to construction sites. This was the tyranny of the administrative-edict system in its chemically pure form. Deprived of its army of millions of prisoners after 1956, the system created new serfs in its stead. In this respect we outrageously violated both our own Constitution and Article 8 (Point 3) of the International Pact on Civil and Political Rights.

... Well, to all appearances, mothers will soon be breathing easily, as the "jail of the peoples" (it is no secret that military construction detachments are corrective labor colonies in miniature) is closing down.

Navy Considers Lifting Sunken Nuclear Submarine

LD1906220190 Moscow World Service in English 2100 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Representatives of the Soviet Navy are holding talks with foreign companies on cooperation in lifting a nuclear submarine that sank in the Norwegian Sea in April last year, following a fire on the vessel. The Soviet side announced a contest for the best technical solution of the problem.

Military Historian Discusses New WWII History

PM2405104790 Moscow APN PRESS RELEASE in English (Undated)

[Interview with Dmitriy Volkogonov, director of USSR Defense Ministry Military History Institute and vice president of World Association of Military Historians; place, date of interview not specified : "USSR: New Approaches to War Against Nazism"—first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Dmitriy Volkogonov, director of the USSR Defense Ministry Institute of Military History and vice president of the World Association of Military Historians, is one of the chief authors of a new 10-volume edition "The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet People." NOVOSTI's Boris Labutin talks to him about this fundamental work which is to be published in the USSR in the near future.

[Labutin] In the USSR this will be the third multivolume work on the history of the Soviet people's war against Nazism. What is its main idea?

[Volkogonov] The Stalinist spirit was not overcome in the first edition (1960-1965). And it was, to a certain extent, resurrected in the second edition published in 1973-1982, the period of stagnation. The very concept of our work will be fundamentally new. Its main task is to honestly tell our readers about the war.

[Labutin] Recent de-Stalinzation of Soviet history has exposed quite a few unknown chapters of the war. What aspects are you going to focus on in your edition?

[Volkogonov] Now that 45 years have passed since the end of the war one can hardly speak of any of its chapters being unknown to historians. The most serious shortcomings of the former editions are half-truths, reticence, and equivokes.

We want our readers to know not only what the entire war cost the Soviet people but what losses we suffered in each battle. We want them to know not only about our victories but about our defeats. For example, four Soviet armies with a total numerical strength of 465,000 were encircled near Kiev in August to September 1941. Soviet troops also suffered a serious defeat near Kharkov and failed to liberate the Crimea in the spring of 1942. These events are given little coverage in soviet publications. Those great tragedies, first of all, resulted from unskilled and thoughtless strategic and tactical guidance.

The first period of the war proved catastrophic for the USSR. On the sixth day of the war the enemy was in the vicinity of Minsk and soon approached Moscow and Leningrad. In the early stages of the war the Nazis acted resolutely and resourcefully. By December 1941 Soviet troops lost 92 percent of the first echelon. But we managed to withstand the enemy's fierce offensive and bring about a radical turn in the war. This shows the tremendous morale of the Soviet people much more eloquently than the shameful suppression of our losses. We know very little about those who ensured our victory. Many names have been undeservedly buried in oblivion or discredited. On the other extreme, others have been extolled to the skies. The same is true of some military operations. Just to please Leonid Brezhnev, the liberation of Small Land near Novorossiysk used to be presented nearly as significantly as the Battle of Stalingrad.

It was only in recent years that the Soviet press has published articles on mass repressions in the Armed Forces in 1937-38. This was one of the reasons for our crushing defeats at the beginning of the war. We should also write about "penalty battalions" as well as trials of commanders and executions which went on after the Nazi invasion. Or take the tragic destiny of Soviet POWs, many of whom were put into Stalin's camps after escaping or being liberated from Nazi death camps.

It's also vital to approach the Allies' role in a new way. Most Soviet historiographers only wrote that the Allies had steadily tried to frustrate the Soviet command's plans, pursued their selfish goals, and nurtured secret schemes. True, all sides had their own interests, but their main common goal was to defeat Nazism. The USSR, certainly, made the decisive contribution to the victory over Nazi Germany. But the Allied Powers gave the USSR tangible assistance, supplying it with food, military equipment, and materials. One can't deny the Allied Powers' role in routing out Japanese militarism and in the victory of World War II in general. In our work we seek to impartially describe the Allied Powers' actions, common interests, and differences.

[Labutin] You believe that the USSR made the decisive contribution to the victory over Nazi Germany. But some Western historiographers still claim that the outcome of the war was decided at the second front....

[Volkogonov] Such a view does exist but hardly any Western historiographers shares it. Debate on this score dates back to the cold war times when both opposing systems absolutized their standpoints. It was politicians rather than historians who distorted the real state of affairs.

In actual fact, countries with different social systems managed to overcome mutual prejudices and jointly oppose Nazism. I think this was the source of today's new political thinking.

[Labutin] Who are the authors of the future edition and how is the work getting on?

[Volkogonov] The editorial staff includes about 30 academicians, corresponding members of the USSR Academy of Sciences, and doctors of history. We invited many scholars to work on the edition. The editorial staff acquainted all competent research institutions with the structure of the new edition and received numerous recommendations. Large conferences will be held on each volume and round tables and workshops on all major issues.

[Labutin] It wasn't very long ago that the previous edition was completed and glasnost in the USSR is still a baby. Not all material has been studied in detail. Is it possible that the coming edition will be premature and only pursue new time-serving goals?

[Volkogonov] No, I rule out such a possibility. The problem is that one can't estimate straightaway certain events, especially in the prewar years and the early war period. Even the coauthors' opinions considerably differ or are rapidly changing. In such a situation a fundamental work may really prove contradictory. But we'll try to acquaint our readers with different versions and approaches.

Baltic Republics

Landsbergis Proposes Possibility of Moratorium

LD1906145190 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Kazis Ustsila]

[Text] Vilnius, 19 Jun (TASS)—"The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet will not discuss the government's proposal in the form in which it was received. It will not vote for or against it either today or this week, or maybe ever," Vytautas Landsbergis, Lithuanian Supreme Soviet chairman, stated today on republican radio. With these words he informed the republic's inhabitants about his attitude to the Lithuanian government's legislative initiative put forward on 16 June. We remind you that the government, "desiring to normalize relations with the Soviet Union," proposes that the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet "discuss the possibility of declaring a temporary moratorium on the 11 March act of restoring the independent Lithuanian state for a period of talks with the USSR," which, in the government's opinion, will be "an active and positive action taking into account the specifically expressed position of political forces in the East and West to solve the Lithuanian problem in a way acceptable to all sides."

Vytautas Landsbergis, speaking on the radio, said that "the Supreme Soviet will think over a broader range of possibilities for beginning talks with the Soviet Union," and in the meantime the government's proposal will be examined by parliament's permanent commissions and its other working bodies.

At the same time the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet chairman drew the population's attention to the fact that "one must not think only in emotional terms" about USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev's proposal on halting the validity of the Lithuanian independence act. In his opinion "the government's attempt to expound one of the possible formulas for initiating talks, which it has proposeed that parliament discuss, should not arouse opposition."

The republic's inhabitants are reacting to the government's proposal in various ways. If some have perceived it as a hope for getting out of the drawn-out situation of uncertainty, then others—true they are only a few—went to the parliament building with slogans of disapproval. At the initiative of the Vilnius town council of Sajudis, a meeting of its supporters speaking against the declaration of a moratorium was held outside the parliament building. The majority of speakers categorically denied the possibility of halting the act on the restoration of an independent Lithuanian state, considering it "inviolable and not open to discussion." Commenting on these actions Vytautas Landsbergis was very much to the point: "Telegrams are fine, there can even be pickets. But let's think, will whole towns and factories go to scythe hay and harvest corn if the blockade continues and combine- harvesters are unable to work due to lack of fuel?"

The head of parliament acquainted deputies at the Supreme Soviet morning session which resumed today to examine the government proposal. Parliament took the information into consideration and went on to discuss other issues.

Landsbergis Presents Proposal

LD1906225790 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Excerpts] At (?a) plenary session of the Lithuanian Supreme Council today Vytautas Landsbergis presented the text of the proposal by the government to proclaim a moratorium on the act of independence for the period of talks with Moscow. He said the proposal gave rise to plenty of questions and suggested that the Supreme Council should first consider the document in its standing commission(?s). The suggestion was approved and the issue is likely to be debated at a full-scale parliamentary sitting next week (?only).

Vytautas Landsbergis noted the importance of clearing up all the possible dangers, legal, constitutional, and others that the moratorium might entail. He also stressed the importance of the public opinion, yet remarked that the first reaction of many was [words indistinct]. [passage omitted]

At the end of today's plenary meeting at the Supreme Council, Vytautas Landsbergis informed the members of parliament that following consultations with the presidium of parliament and the government, Moscow's proposal to send two Lithuanian representatives to take part in drawing up the new draft of the Soviet Union treaty had been rejected.

It has not been released who had signed the telegram sent from Moscow, while the Lithuanian answer points out that the republic is going to specify in greater detail its stand about the possibility of such a cooperation as the economic blockade makes the stand hard to define. At the same time Vytautas Landsbergis notes that Lithuania has been and still is interested in democratic changes in the Soviet Union.

Lukyanov Cited on Proposal

LD1906230490 Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by Vitas Usas]

[Excerpt] Finally, also some news from Moscow: The Lithuanian Council of Ministers' proposal to the Lithuanian Supreme Council, on a possible moratorium of the 11 March act, has been very attentively examined at the Kremlin. Participants at the meeting were informed, the USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, Anatoliy Lukyanov, has stated in a telephone conversation, that the adoption

of such a moratorium decision could create preconditions for negotiations between the Soviet Union and Lithuania. [passage omitted]

Minister, Deputy on Proposal

LD1906160990 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Excerpts] [Announcer] Last Saturday the Lithuanian government suggested that the Supreme Council discuss the possibility of proclaiming a moratorium on the 11 March act of the restoration of Lithuania's independence. [passage omitted]

The Lithuanian Minister of Justice, Pranas Kuris, told Radio Vilnius he found the moratorium the best option if the act of independence had to be touched in one way or other:

[Begin Kuris recording in Lithuanian with superimposed English translation] So far no one is making any decision, and I think if such a decision on the moratorium variant is agreed upon, though I'm not sure it will, the term moratorium can be given a priority, perhaps. Because moratorium was known already in Roman law, and in case of a moratorium, a given right or obligation is not blotted out in juridical terms; it remains. In our case, applying a moratorium would mean that we only exercise our sovereign right as a state to slow down the realization of the independence act. [end recording]

[Announcer] Minister Pranas Kuris thinks that the moratorium ought to be proclaimed only after the terms of talks with the Soviet Union have been strictly defined.

[Begin Kuris recording] Without a preliminary agreement on our status and on the laws that Lithuania is to go by during the interim period, there can be no talk of proclaiming a moratorium. If the moratorium is interpreted as our refusal of what we have gained, and if the Soviet Constitution is to come into force in Lithuania again, the moratorium is totally unacceptable. [end recording]

[Announcer] Pranas Kuris, the Lithuanian minister of justice. Meanwhile, Gedeminas Vagnorius, a member of the Presidium of the Supreme Council, is far from enthusiastic about the government's initiative.

[Begin Vagnorius recording in Lithuanian with superimposed English recording] It was stressed at the meeting of the Presidium yesterday that the decision of the government is premature, and made without consultations with parliament. Therefore, it can provoke unscheduled debates in parliament this week. And what I fear is that the discussions may not so much focus on the contents of the document as on whether it was a tactful move on the part of the government or not. [end recording]

[Announcer] It is next to impossible to predict today what decisions the Lithuanian parliament will take concerning the moratorium on the act of independence. The initial reaction in the Supreme Council, however, suggests that such a moratorium will not be proclaimed. And again, the Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene and her Deputy Romualdas Ozolas are in Greece now, and the MPs [Members of Parliament] will most probably want to hear their say before adopting such an important historical decision.

Prunskiene on Proposal

LD1906220590 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Announcer Edvinas Butkus report]

[Text] Meanwhile, Lithuanian Prime Minister Kazimiera Prunskiene, who is on a visit to Athens, [word indistinct] told AP Press Agency that her government has taken note of the advice of the United States, France, and West Germany to announce a moratorium of the Lithuanian Act of Independence. Kazimiera Pruskiene also stated that the Lithuanian government does not blindly obey the advice of Western leaders, however, Lithuania does not wish to isolate itself at a time when Moscow is showing signs of compromise.

Commissions To Discuss Topic

LD1906221390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1918 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent S. Bykhun]

[Text] Vilnius, 19 Jun (TASS)—Today at the morning session of the republic's Supreme Soviet, the deputies listened to the report of chairman of the Lithuanian parliament V. Landsbergis on the decision of the republic's government which was adopted on 16 June. It proposes that the Supreme Soviet declare a moratorium on the 11 March act "of the proclamation of an independent Lithuanian state."

The chairman of the parliament stressed that it is necessary to seriously examine this document. An explanation of the concept of moratorium itself is insufficient, it is also necessary to know what will be linked with what and what the constitutional and legal dangers for Lithuania can be after the declaration of this moratorium.

At the session, it was decided to discuss this question at first in the standing commissions and the presidium of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet and tentatively start its examination at the plenary meeting of parliament next week. The postponement of the debate is also connected with the absence of the chairman of the republic's Council of Ministers, K. Prunskiene, and of deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers R. Ozolas, who are now in Greece.

At the session, a decision by the Supreme Soviet of the Lithuanian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] was adopted on the procedure for applying Articles 7 and 35 of the law "On Citizenship of the Lithuanian SSR", which came into force on 3 November 1989. It says in these

articles that "a citizen, who possesses citizenship of another state can be granted citizenship of the Lithuanian SSR by way of exception." And further: "Prior to exercising their free choice of citizenship, persons can enjoy the rights of citizen of the Lithuanian SSR for two years after the present law comes into force."

Starting from 20 June 1990, the government of the Lithuanian republic has been instructed to organize the issuing of citizens' certificates to those persons who have decided to adopt citizenship of the Lithuanian Republic.

The hasty adoption of this decision was connected above all with the call-up of Lithuanian youths for service in the USSR Armed Forces.

Moreover, the deputies approved two appeals—to the European Council and to the European Parliament, signed by the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. These appeals express the request for Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia to be granted special status which assists the integration of these republics in the European family, and also to create an official Baltic interparliamentary group for participation in the work of the European Parliament and the soonest possible resolution of questions connected with restoring the statehood of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

By the end of the evening session, V. Landsbergis read out the reply of the Lithuanian Supreme Soviet to the invitation of the leadership of the Soviet Union to take part in drawing up a new union treaty about the federation. It says in the reply that, proceeding from the present situation, the participation of representatives from Lithuania is possible only as experts or observers.

Baltics Send Letters to European Parliament

LD1906155390

[Editorial report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1313 GMT on 19 June, in its live relay from the Lithuanian Supreme Council session, broadcasts Deputy Antanavicius' remarks presenting draft letters to the European Parliament. He says that currently an opportunity to start some actions in the European Parliament and the European Council have become available to Lithuania. Deputy Antanavicius says that many members of the European Parliament have promised to support Lithuania. There is a possibility to set up an inter-parliamentary Baltic group at the European Parliament which would mean that a group consisting of deputies of the European Parliament is set up to deal with matters of the Baltic states. A letter to the European Parliament has been written which now has to be confirmed by the Supreme Council.

Reading out the letter, he says: "To President Anders Bjoerck. Esteemed President, we express our pleasure in constantly widening links between the European Council of which you are president, and the states of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia which have been recently reinstated. We would like to point out that for many years our states were official members of the League of Nations and only after world War II broke out did our states become victims of predatory agreements between Stalin and Hitler.

Unfortunately, after the war the Western democratic states were too weak in the negotiations with the Soviet Union which was militarized and ready for further violence. As a result of this, Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, independent states of Europe, were left in the Soviet occupation.

The time for reinstatement of the historical truth has come. Independence has been legitimately reinstated by our states and we are determined to become democratic partners of European countries.

Therefore, we appeal to you and all the foreign ministers of the 23 countries, members of the European Council, to grant Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia the status of a delegation of special guests. This would allow us to gradually integrate into the family of European nations, to participate in the solution of vital interests of Europe, to learn democracy, and go along the path of social, economic, and humanitarian progress more rapidly.

This appeal has been adopted by the Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian Supreme Councils-Parliaments."

Antanavicius then says that the text of the letter has been agreed on with deputy chairmen of the Latvian and Estonian Supreme Councils. A vote is taken and the letter is given support by the Lithuanian Supreme Council.

Following this, the second letter is read out which will also be signed by the chairmen of the Supreme Councils of the three republics.

Antanavicius then reads this letter as follows: "To Enrique Baron Crespo, president of the European Parliament.

Esteemed President,

The Supreme Councils of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia appeal to you, esteemed president, as well as the leaders of all fractions at the European Parliament, asking you to set up an official inter-parliamentary delegation of Baltic countries in the European parliament. This would enable a more successful cooperation of efforts of all Baltic countries, to build gradually a common European home. This would enable the Baltic republics to participate constructively in the work of the European Parliament, to restore the real statehood of LIthuania, Latvia, and Estonia more rapidly and to set up a democratic system in these countries. This would also help to get rid of the shameful consequences of Stalin and Hitler's pact, the relic of the World War II, and to start successful cooperation with all European countries while changing the economic system of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia which had been imposed on us by the Soviet occupation. We are expecting your positive decision."

A vote on support for the letter is then taken, and support is given.

Latvian City To Ignore Ban on Lithuanian Exports

LD1906191290 Riga Domestic Service in Latvian 1730 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] A session of the Ventspils city soviet of people's deputies has adopted a decision by which an instruction by Konarev, USSR minister of road transport [as heard], prohibiting the dispatch of raw materials, food, and consumer goods to the republic of Lithuania is deemed to be not in force in the territory of Ventspils.

Council Declines Invite To Draft Union Agreement

LD1906223190 Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Edvinas Butkus report]

[Text] Nearing the end of today's Supreme Council Plenary Session, Vytautas Landsbergis announced to the deputies that, upon consultation with both the presidium and the government, Moscow's invitation to send two authorized delegates, to prepare a new draft Union Agreement, has been turned down.

No announcement was made on who had signed this Moscow telegram.

The reply noted that the Lithuanian republic will soon define its stance concerning the possibilities of such cooperation. It would be difficult to explain cooperation under blockade (?conditions) [words indistinct].

At the same time, it was noted in the reply by Vytautas Landsbergis, that Lithuania continues to be interested, as it has been previously, in having democratic restructuring continue in the Soviet Union and that consideration is being given to a possible expert or observer status during the preparation of a Union Agreement.

Vilnius Radio Carries 19 June Supreme Council

Agenda Approved

LD1906083990

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0700 GMT on 19 June begins a live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The announcer notes that before the beginning of the session people gathered in front of the building of the Supreme Council in protest against the moratorium.

At 0704 GMT Deputies Kuzmickas and Abisalas are in the chair.

At 0705 GMT Deputy Abisalas reads proposed agenda, as follows:

"1. A proposal to the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania has been advanced by the government of the republic of Lithuania. I shall ask the esteemed chairman of the Supreme Council to present it. I can say at once that I hope that no debates on this issue will be held today.

"2. The appointment of the director general of Lithuanian radio and tv.

"3. Amendments and supplements to the Civil and Administrative Rights Violation Code of the Republic of Lithuania. The issue will be presented by the Legal System commission; the report will be made by Algimantas Kumza; a draft law will be presented.

"4. Deputies Antanavicius and Sakalas will present two letters to the European Parliament which should be supported by the Supreme Council—or, of course, not supported. We shall decide this.

"After lunch we have already decided to hold debates on the draft law on insurance. The question will be presented by the Budget Commission, the presenter will be deputy Audrius Rudys.

"Also after lunch the issue concerning the decisions adopted by the Vilnius rayon council on 24 May, 1990 will be discussed because this was decided a week ago. The question will be presented by the Legal System Commission and the Local Government Commission; presenter deputy Juknevicius, if the presenter has not been replaced by somebody else.

"And, if of course any time is left, presentation of the second part of the draft regulations of the Supreme Council of the republic of Lithuania and perhaps we shall have a possibility to discuss the second part to some extent. The draft of this document have been given to you."

The agenda is approved by a majority of votes.

Moratorium Proposal Read

LD1906090190

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian continues its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

At 0710 GMT Landsbergis reads a letter from the republican government to the Supreme Council on the moratorium and states that this problem should be very carefully examined, also taking into account the opinion of the people of Lithuania. So far this letter from the government is only a proposal; there have been other proposals and, in his opinion, there is no need to start debates today. This problem should first be discussed in the commissions. Now the Supreme Council should only acknowledge the existence of this letter as one possible option. The opinion of the people of Lithuania should also be considered.

At 0720 GMT there are questions and proposals on the possible consideration of this problem: the position of the moratorium from the legal point of view should be

considered; views of all parties should be known before any decision taken; all deputies should organize meetings with the electors on this problem.

At 0727 GMT a vote is taken whether to listen to a report by Justice Minister Kuris on the significance of the moratorium. This proposal is rejected by a majority of votes.

At 0730 GMT the session moves to the next item on the agenda—the appointment of the radio and television general director. A report is made by Katinas, chairman of the Lithuanian Radio and Television directorate. He proposes the candidatures of Dominijonas Sniukas and Skirmmantas Valiulis to this post.

At 0736 GMT Deputy Abisalas says that the biographies of both candidates have been distributed among the deputies.

At 0738 GMT various questions, including those concerning procedure, are raised.

At 0743 GMT Deputy Ilgunas, on behalf of the science and education commission, states that his commission has decided to propose two candidatures for this post. This commission voted by a majority for the candidature of Valiulis.

At 0740 GMT procedural questions are discussed. Since the candidature of Sniukas has been already debated by the Supreme Council, the council should now examine only the candidature of Valiulis.

At 0753 GMT further procedural questions are raised.

At 0758 GMT further procedural questions are raised.

At 0800 GMT debates continue on the candidatures of Sniukas and Valiulis to the post of the radio and tv general director.

At 0812 GMT questions are put to the candidates on reducing political programs on television, on negotiations with Moscow about reducing broadcasting time for reasons of economizing, on various programs, on supplying information about agriculture, etc.

At 0834 GMT a message from the Swedish town of Karlskrona is read; representatives of that town send their greetings to the Supreme Council and also the coat of arms of their town as a gift.

At 0835 GMT the session is adjourned for 30 minutes.

Insurance Law Debated

LD1906142290

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 0905 GMT on 19 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

The presenter says that the debate on the moratorium will take place in the Supreme Council next week.

At 0906 GMT Valiulis submits his program if he is elected to the post of the radio and TV general director. He complains that as yet TV and radio broadcasts are still suffering from the Bolshevik totalitarian past; a reform of radio and television is already taking place. First of all, the structure must be reorganized and this work has already to some extent has been carried out. Staff responsibilities are being reviewed. Changes in the programs must take place. More attention should be paid in television to the problems of independence, it should show everything that unites the people of Lithuania.

At 0919 GMT there are questions to the candidate: What first steps will be taken by the candidate after his appointment? What is his attitude to agriculture? How should political broadcasts be reorganized? Should not more foreign broadcasts be shown on Lithuanian television?

At 0930 GMT debates on the candidates take place.

At 1030 GMT by a majorioty of votes it is decided to vote alternately for the candidates and then ask who abstained.

At 1031 GMT the vote is taken, 36 voted for Domijonas Sniukas and 62 voted for Skirmantas Valiulis. Thus Skirmantas Valiulis is elected to the post of the Lithuanian radio and television general director. A decision of the Suspreme Council on this is adopted.

At 1035 GMT the session is adjourned until 1200 GMT.

At 1200 GMT the session resumes its work. A draft law on insurance is being debated.

At 1205 GMT a report on the draft insurance law is made.

At 1218 GMT various questions concerning insurance, both compulsory and voluntary are asked.

At 1231 GMT debates on the draft insurance law take place.

At 1259 GMT by a majority of votes the session decides by the first reading to approve the draft insurance law. It is to be published in the press. The law is to be passed later on.

At 1305 GMT a report is made on amendments to some articles in the civil code. It is decided to debate this problem later.

At 1313 GMT letters to the European Parliament and the European Council are read. Both letters are approved.

At 1322 GMT Deputy Lapinskas introduces draft amendments to the law on citizenship. These amendments state that persons who have Lithuanian citizenship cannot be at the same time citizens of another state. Thus Lithuanian youths who refuse to serve in the Soviet Army renounce at the same time their Soviet citizenship

because they are only Lithuanian citizens and have no need to serve in a foreign army.

At 1328 GMT Deputy Rupeika advises not to give up Soviet passports too soon, because Lithuania is so far not recognized and people cannot travel abroad with Lithuanian citizenship certificates. They cannot also go to work in the republics in the Soviet Union without Soviet passports.

At 1332 GMT debates take place. A decision of the Supreme Council on amendments to the Lithuanian citizenship law paragraphs 7 and 35 is put to the vote and adopted.

Lithuanian Poles' Problems Viewed

LD1906164790

[Editorial Report] Vilnius Domestic Service in Lithuanian at 1400 GMT on 19 June resumes its live relay of the Lithuanian Supreme Council session in Vilnius.

A report on the decision of the Vilnius Rayon Council on not recognizing the republic of Lithuania is read.

At 1419 GMT a decision of the Supreme Council on the actions of the Vilnius Rayon Council is read.

At 1420 GMT a statement by deputies of the (?Vilnius and Salcininkai) rayon councils is made.

At 1426 GMT statements are made by the Vilnius Polish Union. An unidentified speaker demands that Polish representatives should take part in the work of the Lithuanian Department on National Minorities.

At 1433 GMT a deputy whose name is indistinct describes various abnormalities in the relations between Polish and Lithuanian speaking populations in the Vilnius rayon: there are no sufficient numbers of intellectuals among the Polish population, not enough schools teaching in Lithuanian and so forth. In his opinion, a completely independent commission should be set up to deal with the problems of national minorities in Lithuania and with the problems of Lithuanians residing in Kaliningrad Oblast, Belorussia, and Poland.

At 1440 GMT debates continue with discussion of Lithuanian Poles' problems. The history of sources of friction between Poles and Lithuanians is detailed, dating back to Polish occupation of Vilnius and surrounding region.

At 1523 GMT a proposal is made to appoint a commission to investigate regional problems and prepare a report for the Supreme Council with their recommendations for addressing these problems.

At 1530 GMT a vote is taken on continuing tonight's session to complete the agenda. The decision is made to continue the session tomorrow.

At 1535 GMT (?Landsbergis) reads a telegram.

At 1543 GMT the session adjourns until 1100 tomorrow.

Lithuanian Developments With Moscow Reviewed

PM1906154190 Moscow TRUD in Russian 19 Jun 90 p 2

[Report by correspondent G. Konchyus: "Lithuania. Has the Ice Broken?"]

[Text] Vilnius—The past week finally brought encouraging news on relations between Vilnius and Moscow. Meetings were held between Lithuanian Prime Minister K. Prunskiene and Deputy Prime Minister A. Brazauskas and N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. V. Landsbergis, accompanied by the chairmen of the Latvian and Estonian Supreme Soviets, met with M.S. Gorbachev, president of the USSR. These are not talks yet. But contacts between the leaders have clearly brought the "truce table" closer.

Since 11 March this year, when the Lithuanian parliament adopted the independence restoration act, after which the Third Congress of USSR People's Deputies demanded its repeal and the president introduced economic sanctions, each side has moved some way toward compromise. Remember the inflexibility with which some politicians at the center rejected the idea of confederative links between the republics and the Union government. Now, however, the president himself is presenting it for discussion at a sitting of the USSR Council of the Federation. The demands to repeal the act on the restoration of Lithuanian independence have given way to more diplomatic formulations—that it be "suspended" or "frozen." And, it seems there are only a few supporters of the continuation of economic sanctions left.

But let us remember something else. "The act on the restoration of Lithuanian independence is sacrosanct and cannot be reviewed or suspended!" is the cry from Vilnius. The view of those people in the independent Lithuanian Communist Party who say that there should be no rush into independence like a naked man hurtling into the brambles but that they should put some clothes on first, in other words, that they should make preparations, has been perceived by the majority of Lithuania's parliamentarians as betrayal of the nation's interests. Now, however, the question has been presented for parliament's discussion.

Which is what has happened. Last Saturday the Lithuanian Council of Ministers proposed that the republic's Supreme Soviet declare a temporary moratorium on the independence restoration act for the duration of the talks. In the government's opinion, the moratorium should be announced at once but should only go into effect after the economic blockade has been lifted and there is agreement to begin talks.

Yesterday this government proposal was only discussed in the lobby at the parliament. This is because K. Prunskiene and her deputy, R. Ozolas, have gone to

Greece to meet with the prime ministers and leaders of political parties. What does this betoken: Confidence that the parliament will accept the government's suggestion unconditionally or a tactical ploy, designed to give deputies time to come to terms with the new idea? Whichever it is, the discussion of this question by the Supreme Soviet will clearly be delayed until their return.

But for the moment an accord has been reached on the resumption of gas supplies to the "Azotas" production association in Jonava (which will surely help to restore the hot water supply to the residents of the republic's largest cities, too) as well as on visas enabling foreign citizens to visit Lithuania, the issue of which was also considerably reduced.

Issue of Pro-CPSU Lithuanian Paper Published

PM2006084190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 June 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by Captain Second Rank V. Gromak under "Direct Line" rubric: "Newspaper Comes Out From Underground"]

[Text] Vilnius—The first issue of the Lithuanian Communist Party (CPSU) newspaper, LITVA SOVETSKAYA [Lithuania, Soviet], has been published in Lithuania.

"This is not a peculiar whim, not a mistake made by the editors through carelessness," the editorial article says. "The transposition, the unusual inversion of words in the title of the newspaper was forced upon us. It is a compromise which we have made after much heartache."

The collective was placed in a tough situation: either they changed the title, or the paper would not be registered. The following "serious" recommendation was even heard: to remove the word "SOVETSKAYA" [Soviet] from the title. The editorial board came to the decision not to make such a profound compromise, agreeing only to modify the title, without touching its essence. What is gained by the registration of the newspaper? It opens up the possibility of printing it in the republic (earlier this was done in Minsk) and of obtaining the premises, equipment, and journalistic office equipment belonging to the CPSU publishing house in Lithuania but for the time being being used by the editorial offices of certain other newspapers; although these papers should be provided with all this by their own publishers—the republic's parliament and Council of Ministers. Registration of the newspaper will also allow it to be distributed openly, through Soyuzpechat kiosks. Unrestricted subscription to the paper will also become possible.

...LITVA SOVETSKAYA. It sounds somewhat unusual. But the paper was, and remains Soviet—that is the main thing.

Estonia Decrees Permission for Private Enterprises

LD0606101790 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 5 Jun 90

["Announcement" by the government of the republic of Estonia]

[Text] Permission has been given to citizens in Estonia to set up private enterprises in the areas of shops and catering. At the moment there already are more than 300 people in the republic who have expressed a wish to establish a private enterprise for trading or catering, and their numbers show a tendency to grow.

Questionnaires demonstrate that 66 percent of these people possess complete or partial starting capital to open activity. Thirty-three percent see no problem with obtaining premises or equipment. Sixty-one percent own means of transportation and 71 percent have the necessary business connections for obtaining goods.

The directive adopted by the government envisages that the registration of private enterprises and the issue to them of trading permits will take place on the basis of the 18 January 1990 Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic Government Resolution Number 12 on endorsing temporary instructions for the registration and issue of permits to operate to enterprises in the Estonian Soviet Socialist Republic. Prices for the goods to be sold in private enterprises will be established on the basis of the 28 May 1990 Republic of Estonia Government Resolution Number 108 on procedures for regulating prices and tariffs. This Republic of Estonia Government resolution will create conditions for implementing the process of changing over to private trading for shops and catering.

Report on Joint Council of Labor Collectives

PM1206152390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 Jun 90 Morning Edition p2

[Dispatch by correspondent Leonid Levitskiy under the rubric "Direct Line": "Readiness for Market Competition"]

[Text] Tallinn—A report and election conference of the Joint Council of Labor Collectives has adopted a decision on establishing an industrial association.

The Joint Council of Labor Collectives is a socioeconomic organization uniting the Russian-speaking enterprises of Estonia. The general politicization has forced it to defend the interests of the non-indigenous population. The Union of Working Women and the Council of Party Organization Secretaries and Enterprise Directors work under its auspices. It is planned to form structures to take in trade union and Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] organizations. The official attitude to the Joint Council of Labor Collectives is negative. About a month ago, the government suspended the council's activity and froze its bank account. The

conference participants sharply condemned this decision. They said that the Joint Council of Labor Collectives will continue to function.

"In conditions where the government's activity and policies are assuming an increasingly strong national character, the Joint Council of Labor Collectives has no alternative. It is the only organization capable of defending the social and economic rights of non-indigenous workers to any real extent," I. Shepelevich, director of the Pegelman Plant, said. "For this we primarily need an independent, effective economic policy."

Shepelevich briefed me on the plan for setting up the industrial association and on its future activity. Initially it will unite enterprises and organizations under union jurisdiction and form a commercial bank. The republic is on the threshold of a market economy. Delegates said that the large enterprises are now in the most difficult position. They are caught in a double net of centralization. The restrictions and prohibitions dictated first by union normative acts and then by republic normative acts have completely deprived them of freedom of action. Only by pooling resources and capital investments and developing direct links both with union departments and horizontally—with industrial associations set up in many regions—will it be possible to survive in the conditions of market competition, price increases, and job cuts. That is the opinion of the specialists. They are sure that the association will be a reliable partner for other sectors and enterprises in the republic. It will also help to ease political tension in the republic.

I. Shepelevich was unanimously elected chairman of the Joint Council of Labor Collectives.

Estonia Adopts Statement on 'Occupation'

LD1906121190 Tallinn Domestic Service in Estonian 1700 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Text] The penultimate—the 11th—session of the Estonian Supreme Soviet was held today. Among other things it adopted a statement on 50 years of Soviet occupation of Estonia.

USSR: Estonian Enterprises Form Association

LD1906132790 Tallinn Estonian Television Network in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Jun 90

[Excerpt] Here, at the Tallinn Poogelmann works, another meeting of the Soviet of Directors, which was set up at the United Council of Work Collectives, was held. The meeting adopted a resolution on establishing an Association of Industrial Enterprises in Estonia, which at the moment already unites about 20 republican enterprises. Ranking among those are the Dvigatel, Prompribor, Baltiyets, Slantsekhim works, and others. Aleksey Lukoshkin, of Tallinn sea port, was elected chairman of the association. The main aim of the association is to achieve economic independence from ministries—from republican as well as all-Union ones. Each association member aims toward freedom in their selection in trading partners and in receiving and distributing profits. This, in the opinion of the directors, will raise motivation for work, and there will be more guarantees for the workforce's social protection. Experience of large Leningrad enterprises has been taken as an example for setting up the association. [passage omitted] [video shows conference delegates at a table perusing papers]

RSFSR

Gorbachev Remarks at 20 June Conference Reported

LD2006111190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0830 GMT on 20 June broadcasts a 12-minute report by station correspondent Yakov Smirnov from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) party conference, including a four-minute recording of Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR president, at the conference.

Smirnov says that the conference was opened today by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov. At Lukyanov's suggestion the delegates congratulate the participants in the conference who are marking the day of their coming into being as the RSFSR Communist Party. Excerpts from various speakers are given, complaining that a whole package of documents were drawn up yesterday but are being withheld from the delegates. Lukyanov denies that there are any underhanded dealings and charges the secretariat with examining the matter.

Lyubimov from the Kemerovo party organization complains that yesterday the draft law, the decree on power, was adopted at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies, but that many of the delegates do not have full information on the RSFSR Congress. He calls upon Gorbachev to set out his personal position with regard to the document that has been adopted, since it refers to issues concerning the fate of the party and whether it should exist or not. He also calls for the Central Committee to convene an extraordinary plenum to debate the emergency situation in the CPSU, since such a situation has to all appearances come to a head.

Gennadiy Maksimovich Khodyrev, chairman of the Credentials Commission, reports to the conference that the election of delegates in all the RSFSR kray and oblast party organizations have been conducted in keeping with the ratified regulations and the norms of representation established by the CPSU Central Committee—one delegate for 4,000 party members. He states that a total of 2,768 delegates have been elected to the 28th party congress, and the absolute majority of the delegates to the conference have been elected on a multicandidate basis. The Credentials Commission has checked the powers of all the delegates and has pronounced them valid. The commission thinks that in electing delegates,

they did not manage to avoid a general tendency which has recently become marked for the participation of workers and peasants to decline in state and party representative bodies, Khodyrev says.

There follows a heated discussion on the presentation of delegates' mandates of 200 guests who had been invited from among workers and peasants who had not been elected by the communists of their areas. One of these workers from Kuibyshev disputes their position as delegates.

The conference then confirms the report by the Credentials Commission acknowledging the powers of the delegates to the Russian conference as valid.

Lukyanov announces the proposal that the conference be invested with the powers of the inaugural congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. This proposal is adopted by a majority of votes—2,316 votes. From this minute the Inaugural Congress of the Communist Party of the RSFSR has been in progress at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, Smirnov says.

Differences on the Decree of Power are expressed at the conference, the draft of which was in the main approved by the deputies of the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies. The delegates to the party conference saw in this document a threat to the very existence of the CPSU, says Smirnov. He says that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev spoke about the proposal that a group of delegates headed by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev should be sent to express the positions of the Russian Federation Party Congress and explain the position.

Gorbachev says: Comrades, given that a reproach has been made here, that some people are not satisfied with the reply I gave on that subject, and the fact that I am currently conducting the issue on the document under discussion in the Supreme Soviet—at the Congress of Russian People's Deputies—I should say this: After a group of secretaries appealed to me, we discussed this issue and exchanged opinions on this issue, and examined in detail the text of the content of this. Critical comments were made and expressed. In my view this document is wholly unfinished. All this was said about the content. Furthermore, such issues in general need working on thoroughly in commissions, a first reading, discussion and so forth, and comparison of points of view. This was also stated, and there was, I must say, a great deal of mutual understanding.

Furthermore, the secretaries of oblast committees here were the first. After this, on the basis of this exchange, the idea was to talk and exchange opinions with people's deputies of the Russian Federation to elucidate the essence and content of this most important document. This was done, too. So the deputies have made their appearance today—and Comrade Yeltsin is in the chair. I even sent Comrade Usmanov to find out; perhaps the issue has already been dealt with, discussed, that is; Gorbachev concludes.

An unidentified speaker says they have not yet started discussing it.

Gorbachev continues: Ah, they have not yet started discussing this issue. So everything relating to the preliminary aspects has been done. My point of view is wholly clear. I expounded it before, when answering questions just the other day. I can now express my opinion on this matter absolutely definitely. Namely, it would be a mistake to adopt the document in the form in which it is presented—I refer only to the section relating to all this. It would be in contradiction to union legislation in general. The question of public organizations has already been discussed in the Supreme Soviet. Furthermore, it would even contradict the international rights pact. USSR deputies told this to the authors who submitted this. This topic was mentioned during the discussion of this document in the Supreme Soviet. So the discussion was correct, normal, as it should be. Points of view were heard and then work was continued with deputies. This work was carried out. On the basis of this work, I think, a crucial debate will take place.

Gorbachev continues: But I can tell you, comrades are all the time suspecting the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, you understand, of some sort of vacillation and jabbering on, and so on. I think, comrades, that people are not taking the general secretary, the president of the country, very seriously. It is not a question of me: Tomorrow, or in 10 or 12 days' time, someone else might be general secretary or party chairman. Before expressing opinions, and accusations all the more so, one has to know and understand a great deal about things, and not just mention it in passing, so to speak. Otherwise, if this is the attitude at the conference or the congresses, or at the Congress of People's Deputies to what we put forward at such crucial stages of history, I must say that we will only end up in chaos. Of that I can assure you. (applause)

Gorbachev continues: So, I have stated my point of view on the work that turns out to be beyond the bounds of this exchange. Other exchanges of opinion have taken place, as you know, but it is the right of the congress to decide whether to submit the resolution. Incidentally, the congress, I think, voted not to send a delegation. What is involved now is only whether to discuss the declaration before submitting it. That is what the difference of opinion boils down to now, I think.

Smirnov says in conclusion: Well, you yourselves have heard all the arguments. Taking account of this elucidation by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and also by delegates Kugultinov and Sobchak, the congress has made a decision not to send a delegation and address from the party congress of the Russian Federation to the RSFSR people's deputies. It has been decided to reserve the right of a consultative vote for invited workers and peasants. In conclusion, I would like to say that the RSFSR Communist Party Congress is continuing its work. Mikhail Sergyevich Gorbachev's report on the first issue is being discussed here.

Russian Communists Vote on 'Founding Congress'

LD2006081790 Moscow TASS in English 0801 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The Conference of Russian Communists, which opened in Moscow on Tuesday to discuss the creation of a Russian Communist Party, today decided to transform itself into the founding congress of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation. Thus the question of creating a communist party in the largest Soviet republic may be considered decided.

The formal decision, expected to be taken later, will require two-thirds of the vote to be passed.

Political, Social Situation Viewed at Conference

LD2006064990 Moscow TASS in English 0642 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Igor Yefimov]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—Participants in the Russian Federation Party Conference, now in its second day in Moscow, this morning continued discussing the political situation and the creation of a Russian Communist Party. There is also exchanges of views on the documents to be discussed at the 28th party congress—the drafts of the Soviet Communist party policy statement and party rules.

The first day of discussion showed that the question of the creation of the Russian Communist Party may be regarded as decided. No one opposed the idea.

The main debate revolved around the social and political situation in the country. Delegates said that the CPSU was in the midst of a deep crisis and was losing popular trust. Workers have begun to leave the party en masse, some said.

Speakers put the blame for this squarely on the party leadership. Many said that people's dissatisfaction was caused by the fact that five years of perestroika had only worsened standards of living and widened the social divide.

The question heard most often is whose interests will the Communist Party of Russia and the CPSU uphold? Will it remain the party of the working class or become an exponent of interests of the nascent small bourgeoisie?

Russian Conference Views Workers' Voting Rights

LD2006095590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 0800 GMT on 20 June broadcast an eight-minute live report by Aleksandr Ruvinskiy from the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] party conference. Ruvinskiy says:

"I am in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, and I would describe what has happened here in the Kremlin today in the past two hours as a great confrontation between two congresses. The point is that we can already describe the Russian Party Conference as the founding congress of the RSFSR Communist Party. A decision was adopted on this at the morning session. True, the title, the precise title, of the future Russian Communist Party is still to be discussed. There is no decision on this yet."

Ruvinskiy recounts the proceedings of the morning session: Khodyrev, first secretary of the Gorkiy Oblast Party Committee, presented a report by the credentials commission. This report was approved and the authority of all the delegates present was approved, he says.

Ruvinskiy continues: "Then the issue was tackled of the status of the workers and peasants who had been invited to this congress. As you know, 300 people were invited—not elected but invited—to the party conference. And the issue was raised of first of all granting them the right of a deciding vote here at the conference, and then, as now already, at the congress. This issue was discussed for a very long time and the workers themselves who had been invited protested against such a status being conferred upon them. They considered this to be a sop from the party. As a result of a ballot, a decision was adopted that they should retain the status of guests with the right of a consultative vote. I believe this to be an absolutely just decision.

"And another very important issue was resolved here at the conference or, now already, at the founding congress: A proposal was received that a statement, a resolution, should be sent to the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies protesting against the fact that work is now taking place at the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies on a decree of authority. I shall recall that, in the main, it has been approved by the congress, and a revision of individual points of it is now taking place. Now it is really being tested here whether Article 6 of the Constitution has actually been rescinded in our country. And I am pleased to report that the delegates, with a majority of votes, adopted a decision not to send a special delegation there from the Russian Party Congress, nor to send any document, so as not to bring pressure to bear upon the Congress of People's Deputies. The point is that proposals have even been submitted that such a deputation should include, for example, Comrade Mashakov, commander of troops of the Volga and Urals military district."

Ruvinskiy recalls that Mashakov spoke at the party conference yesterday, where he described the professional-public activity of Arbatov, Korotich, Sobchak, Gelman, Yegorov and Yakovlev as a defamation of the armed forces of the MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] and KGB. Mashakov also recalled, with pleasure, the times when our grandfathers defeated three noblemen on all fronts in the Civil War.

Ruvinskiy says: "This is the kind of comrade that they were proposing to include in this delegation. I can imagine what reaction there might have been to this at the Congress of People's Deputies; nevertheless, common sense prevailed."

In conclusion, Ruvinskiy says there is now a break at the congress, but Gorbachev has been surrounded by congress participants, and "some sharp discussion" is continuing.

19 June Russian Party Conference Continues

Osadchiy Reads Report

LD1906185790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1753 GMT on 19 June begins broadcasting a recording of the Russian Party Conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

Ryzhkov chairs the session. He opens this part of the conference by announcing that three coreports for the preparatory committee, for the Democratic Platform, and the Marxist Platform will be heard and debates conducted.

Deputy Osadchiy presents a report on behalf of the preparatory committee. Russian communists, he says, have embarked upon the final stage of their party construction. He quotes Lenin: One must look the unpleasant truth in the face. The party is in trouble. A way must be found out of the blind alley.

At 1758 GMT Osadchiy reviews the history of the work of the preparatory committee and the difficulties it has experienced. There was a lack of organization; some working groups only got down to business a month ago. The party leadership bears responsibility for this, as does the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee. Initiative committees were operating, however, in a number of cities; this was an attempt to solve the problems from below.

At 1801 GMT Osadchiy mentions some of the decisions of the Leningrad conference, which took place for the sake of the unity of the party. The views of the Democratic Platform and the Marxist Platform were represented. Most members worked with communists locally, made speeches, and appeared in the media. Draft decisions were circulated to all delegates 10 days ago, but once again the lack of organization got in the way of things. Many delegates criticize the party leadership and particularly the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee for lack of initiative, says Osadchiy. The party has lost its militancy and has lost its positions in the vanguard of the Soviet people. Instead of rallying the people, the CPSU leadership has left it to the mercy of the forces on the arena. Applause follows.

Osadchiy goes on: In this situation the matter of forming an Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic (RSFSR) Communist Party is more important than ever before; it is overdue. He talks about the mass media which have only just started discussing this issue.

At 1808 GMT Osadchiy gives the title of a report prepared for circulation today to delegates, which once again has not been prepared in time. Each decision of the preparatory committee was born in an atmosphere of heated argument. The committee wants an RSFSR party formed before the 28th CPSU Congress. What kind of party should it be? There are various opinions, but the majority view is that only a Lenin-type Communist Party can get the RSFSR out of its present troubles. Lengthy applause follows. We must get rid of dogmas old and new, says Osadchiy. We have no right to ignore the mood and the proposals of the majority of Russians who hold socialism dear. He speaks about the false thesis of the deideologization of Russia.

Democratic Platform Report Read

LD1906195590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1812 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian party conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

Deputy Osadchiy continues presenting his supplementary report for the preparatory committee. Osadchiy says: We recognize only one type of centralism: democratic centralism. Major decisions should be taken either at party congresses or by party referendum, only then can one avoid a situation in which sharp turnarounds are carried out without the approval of the party. Many laws and party program documents fail to work because the will of the people has not been considered. The Leninist behest on the role of the peasant in ruling bodies must be implemented, says Osadchiy. It is up to you to put this right, comrades; you have an historic responsibility to do so.

At 1815 GMT Ryzhkov says that after the lunch break, two more coreports will be heard. He declares a 90-minute break.

At 1816 GMT the leadership is shown returning to the platform.

At 1816 GMT an unidentified deputy proposes that the conference be declared a congress.

Ryzhkov announces the proposal that a wreath be laid at Lenin's mausoleum on behalf of the conference. He asks presidium members to gather at the mausoleum for this purpose. He then invites Vladimir Nikolayevich Lysenko to deliver his report on behalf of the Democratic Platform.

At 1817 GMT Lysenko says that an analysis of the present situation is essential. The CPSU, he says, is losing the support of the people both throughout the Soviet Union and in our republic. The moment of truth is approaching for the CPSU; it either does the right

thing, or it prepares to leave the political stage. He supports the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies' declaration on sovereignty. The Democratic Platform is concerned most of all with the question of what kind of party the CPSU is going to be.

At 1822 GMT Lysenko outlines three approaches to the question of the formation of the RSFSR. He describes his vision of the view of the central party leadership as to what the RSFSR party should be like. He says that the documents of the preparatory committee do not reflect the position of the Democratic Platform. He says we have to set up a party to begin the rebirth of our republic, to ensure effective economy, national concord. We must not set ourselves the utopian goals that the CPSU has set itself hitherto. We must reject totalitarianism and embrace democratization.

Lysenko continues: We must react vigorously to the dynamics of life. It must be a genuinely democratic party, guaranteeing the rights of minorities. It is not true that these things are already provided. Recently he took a package of Democratic Platform documents to the PRAVDA office and not one of them has been published. Let's not make this the constituent congress; let's draw up alternative variants for submission perhaps to a referendum. We could hold the constituent congress after the 28th party congress. I call upon all delegates to be responsible in their attitude to the decisions being taken, says Lysenko. Applause then follows the conclusion of Lysenko's speech.

At 1829 GMT Kalganov is invited to speak on behalf of the Marxist Platform of the CPSU. He says that the launching of the Marxist Platform was not a move directed against the party. The question is this: Is the Russian Federation to have a renewed Communist Party capable of getting it out of its current problems? He outlines a number of what he considers to be essential conditions. The Union government's proposals for putting right the economic situation do perhaps move in the right direction, but they contain inherent flaws. The important thing is not whether or not there is to be a market, but what kind of market it is to be. A positive solution is possible only if the levers that control operations on the market are in the hands of the workers. The trade unions must be renewed and given an important role. Federations of consumers' societies should cope with retail trade problems. House construction must be taken out of the hands of the large mass organizations. Local soviets have an important role.

Marxist Platform Report Read

LD1906202390

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1835 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian Party Conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

Deputy Kalganov continues presenting his coreport on behalf of the CPSU Marxist Platform. Kalganov goes on to say: Of course there is going to be a cost. Compensation must be provided for those in need. The transition to a market economy must not be an end in itself, but a means of serving a greater goal. He says: We must work out our own ideas as to what we mean by socialism and a socialist society. There is no clear concept today of what is meant by progress toward socialism. It is difficult to expect complete clarity here; more work must be done.

At 1837 GMT Kalganov discusses what the party should be: a voluntary association of like-minded people. But there must be rules and regulations. What is adopted by a majority of party members must be fulfilled; but we oppose fractionalism. Party organizations must be truly autonomous in resolving local issues. There is a need for work in the localities where people live to be stepped up considerably, also work in the mass organizations. The party must be capable of participating in political dialogue with other parties. We have an alternative choice: either go back to being the kind of ruling party we used to be, or turn to the masses.

At 1841 GMT Kalganov says that the forthcoming CPSU party congress must work out policy. There must be new elections for a new Central Committee; we must know who is who. There is applause. I remind you of our shared responsibility. The party is in a state of crisis, says Kalganov. Many people are leaving the party. The main thing now is the profound democratic renewal of the party. There is the danger of our slipping into communist sections incapable of implementing the policy of the masses of the working people.

At 1844 GMT Ryzhkov invites Tyulkin to speak for 15 minutes on behalf of the Leningrad Initiative Congress of Russian Communists.

Tyulkin at 1845 GMT begins with his thanks for the opportunity to address the conference. He says that the initiative congress is not a platform within the CPSU. It was set up to further the call for an RSFSR Communist Party as a result of the lack of enthusiasm encountered by these ideas from the center. The initiative movement, I say again, is not a political platform. We seek to unite the communists of the RSFSR within the CPSU. He goes on to say: Of course, the question of the formation of an RSFSR Communist party is not just an organizational one, though organizational aspects are inherant in it. The initiative movement seeks the organization of a Communist Party on Leninist principles. We found complete unity of views with the preparatory committee for this conference under Comrade Osadchiy. Why then has the reaction to the Leningrad initiative group been so diverse? Why should there be a party?

Tyulkin continues: One cannot agree with those who accuse the party of engaging too much in theories. In our view the party today has a kind of dogmatism of perestroyka which claims that there is no alternative. Slogans are interpreted in a dogmatic way. This conceals a departure by the party from the class analysis and the class approach to the resolution of problems. Why do

party documents never present an analysis of the stratification which is indeed taking place in society? Different kinds of demagoguery are being foisted upon the party under the guise of democratization. He mentions the numbers of people who are leaving the party.

Tyulkin Speaks

LD1906205890

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1855 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian party conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

Tyulkin, speaking on behalf of the Leningrad Initiative Congress of Russian Communists, continues his speech. He touches on the "demogogic interpretation" of the concept of pluralism. Pluralism is the main ideology of the party today, he says. Tyulkin goes on to outline what he understands by like-mindedness. It does not mean that people should not speak their mind. All are in favor of the slogan: All power to the soviets. But the party leadership, in advocating this slogan, has been ill-prepared in so doing. We consider party factions to be essential, but the mechanisms for them must be spelled out precisely in the new party statute.

At 1859 GMT Tyulkin says: In economic policy, the initiative group does not have any strong position for or against perestroyka; but there can be no escaping the need to work out economic and social policy. It is fair to ask: Why is it that at this particular time in working out new policy no one has consulted us communists? He mentions the anti-alcohol campaign. Of course the situation today is not what is was on 3 April when the preparatory committee met for the first time. Then the leadership was against; now a majority of the leadership is in favor of an RSFSR party. Tyulkin concludes at 1901 GMT with: Comrade communists of our republic, unite! Applause follows.

Ryzhkov then invites Valeriy Ivanovich Ladygin to take the floor for 10 minutes. Ladygin, an engine driver from Chita, says that the conference should declare the formation of a Communist Party of the RSFSR and elect its leading bodies. We categorically oppose the deferment of these elections until after the 28th party congress, he says. The choices cannot be put off; this question must be decided at the conference. So what will we bring to the 28th CPSU Congress? A majority of the workers of the Transbaykal region are in favor of the CPSU, a renewed party of the Leninist-type. The rights of the minorities must be guaranteed. The party must not be in the hands of apparatchiks. We seek the formation of a law-governed state, and there must be law-governed relationships within the party. The issue of the privileges of the party apparatus members must be clarified. The CPSU Central Committee must report back on the five failed years of perestroyka. We consider that every politburo member must speak about his work. We do not think that the politburo should be abolished.

Ladygin speaks about the party budget and party contributions. He says: We are tired of too much talk and too little action. Ladygin concludes with an appeal from his party organization to cast off personal, group, and party ambitions and act in a spirit of friendship between the nations, respect for human rights, and raising the authority of the Soviet Union and the RSFSR. Applause follows.

At 1911 GMT Ryzhkov gives the floor to (Sergey Leonidovich Serokurov) the first secretary of the Murmansk Oblast party committee.

At 1912 GMT an unidentified delegate rises from the floor to object to elements in a previous speech.

(Serokurov) takes the floor. He hopes that this conference will turn into the constituent congress of hte RSFSR Communist Party. Gorbachev has convinced us of the need to preserve the integrity of the CPSU. While we have been talking about what is to be done, other parties have appeared like mushrooms after a rainfall. It is painful to see political controversy in the RSFSR. One cannot accept the way the RSFSR has been treated in recent years.

He speaks of the problems of the Kola Peninsula area: the presence of the naval base, the felling of trees. This has happened because we do not have a well thought-out policy. There was no one at the center to do the thinking.

The first thing about the RSFSR Communist Party is that it must work within the CPSU, says (Serokurov). The Russian Communist Party must take on itself the role of the backbone of the CPSU. The issue of that party's independence must be looked at in light of what is happening within the RSFSR as a whole. It must be able to work out program documents and resolve its own organizational problems. Its formation must reflect the organizational structure of the CPSU. Part of the CPSU Central Committee's responsibilities must fall to the Central Committees of the republican communist parties. The program must define the party's attitude toward socialism. There can be no compromise over ideology, and in one party there is no room for more than one ideology. There have been serious mistakes in the theoretical work of the party, which are partly responsible for bringing us into a state of stagnation. Will we form the bodies now or postpone it? Our delegation is firmly of the view that further delay in resolving organizational issues is impermissible. The bodies should have been formed yesterday. Elections for the politburo should be on the basis of alternative candidates. Applause follows.

Speaker Urges Unity

LD1906210990

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1921 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian party conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

At this time, Ryzhkov invites (Suldyakin) from a Saransk factory to take the floor. He says: The view is that there should be an RSFSR Communist Party and it is our job to elect its leading bodies. The speaker goes on to express the views of his constituents concerning the nature of the RSFSR Communist Party. The question should be decided primarily by the primary party organizations, he says. How is it that we have so far forgotten about the rank and file members of the party? Despite what the rules say, the rank and file have become obedient to those above them. It was open dictatorship which became the norm, says (Suldyakin). The only obligation on party members was to pay their contributions and turn up at party meetings. In 12 years, only once has a representative from the Central Committee visited my factory and discussed issues on equal terms, said the deputee. Don't be suprised that relations built upon diktat have so easily collapsed. The main protagonist in our Communist Party must be the individual communist and the primary party organization, (Suldyakin) asserts. The CPSU congress must change the rules so that all party organizations are equal. He speaks about the relationships that should exist between the primary party organizations and those immediately above them—the rayon and the town party organizations. Many reasons have been given for the current crisis within the party, one of them being the fact that party decisions have not been carried out. A mechanism must be provided to ensure that they are carried out in the future (Suldyakin) concludes. The camera dwells on Yeltsin and Gorbachev in animated conversation on the platform.

At 1931 GMT Ryzhkov invites (Tatyana Lepakova) to take the floor. She says that genuine economic independence is impossible without political independence. Those who chose me as a delegate told me to unite within the CPSU and not to allow a split in the party, she says. Rank and file party members at meetings have criticized the Central Committee and the politburo for having gotten out of touch with the people. Gorbachev, Ligachev, Medevedev, Slyunkov and other members of the politburo should be called to account for five wasted years at the forthcoming 28th congress of the CPSU, says (Lepakova). Deeds do not match the words that are spoken. She quotes the words of a song by Lyudmila Zykina. We must recognize where the blame lies for the failure of perestroyka, she says. We must recognize political pluralism of ideas but not reject communist ideology. The party must raise the living standards of the people. It must look after the destiny fo the countryside. Year by year, the countryside is getting poorer: the young people are leaving it. There is an acute shortage of cadres in the Vologda ocuntryside. Many farm workers never have a day off. There are shoratges of housing, gas and electricity, roads. Correct exchange between town and countryside must be provided. As a teacher, Lepakova speaks about the problems of young people and the Komsomol (All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League) as an organization. The party must recognize the independence of the Komsomol, the Komsomol must recognize the leadership of the party. The old ideals have gone: new ones have not yet taken their place. Indifference and passivity are the most dangerous features we are combatting, says (Lepakova). The 1984 school reform was not backed up with material support. Cultural affairs are in a similarly poor plight. The teacher in the countryside has too many burdens and no one with whom they can be shared. (Lepakova) says she has to compete against the mass media and objects to pornography and eroticism making its appearance there. Who has prepared us for the moral crisis, she asks, the growth in the crime rate? We shall not solve our economic problems unless we raise our cultural standards. The Russian people are patriotic by tradition and they are patient—but there are limits to patience. Let's make it our goal to raise educational and cultural standards, (Lepakova) concludes.

Gidaspov Speaks

LD1906213590

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 1945 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian party conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

Ryzhkov makes two announcements: Starodubtsev has asked for a meeting of agrarian delegates; and a meeting of first secretaries will take place in the cloakroom. Ryzhkov declares a 30-minute interval.

At 1946 GMT the leadership is shown returning to the platform.

At 1948 GMT Manayenkov, the new chairman, invites Vladimir Golovachev, the first secretary of the Saratov party organization, to speak.

Golovachev supports the idea of the formation of an RSFSR Communist Party. There should be a party and political structure in the republic to correspond to the republic's new legislative structure. The new CPSU structure will enable relations between the center and the republics to be placed upon a new footing. Previously Russia was discriminated against; Russia constitutes a certain integrity. The lack of a Russian Communist Party encroaches upon the interests of Russians. It should be called the Communist Party of the RSFSR. It should be within the CPSU; it should be a Leninist-type party; and it should be the equal of the Communist Parties of the other Union republics. Its objectives should be socialism, renewed in keeping with the latest achievements of humanity. It would be true to Marxism-Leninism. Points of contact must constantly be sought with all democratic movements.

Golovachev detects a rapprochement between the positions of the various platforms within the party and considers that this could be the basis of a new unity. One can understand the concern of the Marxist Platform people. The formation of the RSFSR is connected also with the dismantling of the old administrative command

system. The democratic platform is mainly the movement of the humanitarian, scientific, and technical intellectuals. Unfortunately today we see divergences between the party's ideology and its economic policy. The government's measures to improve the economy run counter to the party's ideology. The government has ideas of a market-run economy; the Central Committee does not. A bridge must be found between the two.

Video shows Gorbachev and Yeltsin conversing together.

At 2000 GMT Gidaspov is invited to take the floor. A deputy rises to ask for a list of speakers.

Gidaspov begins by outlining the background which has led to the present conference and the crisis within the CPSU. He speaks of the absence of any ideological backing for perestroyka which has taken the party by surprise. The CPSU is being turned into a conglomerate of factional formations. The task of our conference is to leave the settling of accounts on one side. I see the Russian Communist Party as one of the most radical Communist Parties. It must be an example of organization. Its radicalism must be displayed everywhere, especially in the establishment of relations with all republics. To do this it must be acceptable to communists. We must display wisdom and patience in the face of difficulties to show that we do have a core upon which we can rely when times are difficult. The program must contain formula to strengthen national consciousness and strengthen internatinalism at one and the same time. He refers to the publication of his vision in the Leningrad initiative for the 28th CPSU Congress. The party must also decide upon its ideology. Communists must work hard on restoring the propagandizing of their views. Ultimately people will judge us by how in reality the social and political program is implemented. The basis is and will remain the working class. We have a right to elect the leadership of the Russian Communist Party. The primary party organizations must have good representation in the Central Committee of the Russian Communist Party.

Gidaspov criticizes the Marxist Platform as being couched in terms of the class and even civil war. Passions are boiling now in debates that are taking place in different forums throughout the country. The time has now come to take constructive action and generate programs which will then be implemented. Let the congress be a congress of civic hope. Applause follows.

Military Situation Viewed

LD1906221190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2010 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian party conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

Delegate Makashov from the Urals Military District takes the floor. He speaks about the tragedy of the current situation, about the CPSU being the party that concerns itself about other parties more than it does about itself. He protests against those who attack the Army, the Ministry of Internal Affairs, and the KGB. He names individual people who have done this. Applause follows. He mentions the situation in the Warsaw Pact, the reunification of Germany, the situation in the Far East. The formula is calculated to appeal to the weak-minded. He assures the audience that the Army and Navy will be needed by the country. Unilaterally reducing our Armed Forces is wrong, he says. There is more applause. Only the blind or the wicked cannot see this. Our Army does nothing; it is led by politicians. Zhukov saved Khrushchev, and Khrushchev sent him into retirement. He speaks of the patriotism and Leninism with which Army people are brought up. The Army delegations do not intend to give in. They will resolutely oppose any attempts to depoliticize the Armed Forces and talks of the so-called victories of diplomacy. We understand that it is difficult for everyone, but the Armed Forces are not to blame.

At 2017 GMT (Gennadiy Ivanovich Sklyar), first secretary of the Obninsk party organization takes the floor. We need serious, well thought out program documents, he says. Success depends on our own ability to change. He speaks about the party rules and what they should say. The power must reside with the party masses. He speaks of party contributions. Interference from above in matters that should be decided by the primary party organizations must be ended.

There are bad pages in the history of the Obninsk party organizations going back to the thirties and in later years. He gives examples of wrong doings by the Obninsk party organization in the 1960's which led to the disruption of scientific work. There must be mechanisms for rehabilitation. He cites other points that should be considered in drawing up the party rules. Party committees must in the future pay for the accommodation they have in factories and organizations. But, in addition to the changes we make to the party, we also must change ourselves; we must think about the standards with which we carry out what has been decided.

I am not one of those who now want to blame Mikhail Gorbachev for everything that has happened in the past five years; we have to look at the pluses as well as the minuses. Our party will be strong enough to overcome the feeling that it must eliminate itself, he concludes.

At 2029 GMT Delegate Yarkin, team leader from the Zelenodolskiy ship-building works in Tatariya, takes the floor and speaks in support of the formation of an RSFSR Communist Party. Why did I ask to speak? Because I am pained over the current state of our party. Why did it happen? Because often we communists have not been sufficiently demanding of each other. There have been mistakes. He speaks about the achievements of the Bolshevik party during the industrialization of the pre-war period and of the space and other scientific achievements of the post-war period. We can still work

well today, producing technology that other countries can only dream about. But the authority of the CPSU has fallen and the reasons for this are incorrect decisions made on the economy during the period of perestroyka. These and other mistakes have led to the shelves of the shop being empty. He laments the fact that the ideological commission of the party does not contain a single worker. He criticizes elements of the economic reforms: privatization and other aspects.

He calls upon the conference to say enough is enough. Will the CPSU remain a workers' party or will it turn into something else? The working class needs its own Communist Party. Those who joined the party because of their convictions are pained over what is happening; those who joined for other reasons are keeping silent. Perestroyka is accompanied by a rising crime rate and other bad manifestations. All are surprised at the way in which the fanning of interethnic discord is tolerated. He speaks, too, of the situation in the Baltics and of the changeover to market conditions. What will the market give the working class, he asks. How many factories will be closed and how many people will be unemployed? Why is the idea of the market being introduced without prior discussion within the party? Applause follows. The workers must retain control over all processes after the changeover to market conditions.

Kemerovo Oblast Leader Speaks

LD1906222790

[Editorial Report] Moscow Television Service in Russian at 2041 GMT on 19 June continues broadcasting a recording of the Russian party conference held at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 19 June.

It is proposed that all delegates go to the wreath-laying ceremony at the mausoleum. The proposal is adopted.

Delegate Melnikov, first secretary of the Kemerovo Oblast CPSU committee, takes the floor. The position of the Kemerovo Oblast delegation has already been set out. The main thing in the work of our congress—for that is what it is—must be discussing the role of the party and electing its leadership. The CPSU now needs examples of being ahead. The party is in turmoil. The country is in a state of crisis. But the party leadership seems to be living in a different dimension. We talk a lot about having chosen the right road, but we do not move forward along it. The party aktiv does its best to explain the decision emanating from the center and in return is rewarded by being called appartchiks. He speaks about last year's strikes by miners in the Kuzbass. But despite dialogue with the government, the situation is still dangerous and explosive. Why? Becuase the goods are still not provided. Only the signs have been changed. The ministry has effectively washed its hands of solving the social problems of the region. We party leaders, he says, are being made to answer for everything: the mistakes of the past and the mistakes of the present. I accept the criticism for my own part as a member of the Central Committee of the perestroyka convocation. He speaks of the party being infected with a virus. He speaks of the monopoly of a narrow circle of individuals on the making of decisions. There is applause. He speaks of the disinformation in the official press about the real situation in the party and in the country. He speaks of the leadership's indifference to the plight of the working people which is leading to a decrease in the number of young people wanting to join the CPSU. If the CPSU continues not to turn toward the working people, then a new party could arise to oppose it. If we miss this opportunity, the class foundation of the party could be lost. It is important, as never before, to direct today the working class movement into a constructive channel. The main duty of the communist is to defend the interests of the working man. The renewed Communist Party will be the one that is supported by the workers. The Russian Communist Party must from the very beginning become the cement of the CPSU, the cement of the Soviet Union. Those who seek a split in the party are not guided by the interests of the country. We have a huge responsibility, he concludes.

It is announced that work begins tomorrow at 1000 [0600 GMT]. The recording concludes at 2100 GMT.

'Text' of Gorbachev's 19 June Conference Speech

LD1906141190 Moscow TASS in English 1343 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Follows the full text of Mikhail Gorbachev's speech at the party conference of Russian Federation communists here today:

Comrades,

Considering the opinion of party organisations and party committees of Russia, the CPSU Central Committee decided at its March plenary meeting to hold a conference of the communists of the Russian Federation from among delegates elected for the 28th party congress.

After discussions at the Central Committee and joint meetings of the Russian Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee and the preparatory committee, formed from among the representatives of all party organisations, it was decided to include in the agenda of the conference two questions:

On the present moment and the creation of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, and on the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee and the CPSU rules for the 28th Party Congress. This proposal was accepted by the conference today.

At the same time, a view was expressed that a single report should be delivered on both issues, which would be discussed simultaneously. This is quite justified.

The mounting processes of perestroika, the novelty of problems before us, and the politisation of society added urgency to the question of new role of the CPSU and its radical renewal so that the potential, inherent in this

political organisation, should meet more accurately and adequately the challenges of time and perestroika itself.

As a result of these considerations and with due regard for the opinion of communists, the party Central Committee decided to move up the date of the 28th party congress and to launch a discussion on the basis of the party Central Committee platform and the draft of new party rules.

Life has shown that it was a correct decision. We entered a decisive phase of deep-going, fundamental changes in society along the road of perestroika.

The success of the cause will depend now on whether or not all sober-minded patriotic forces are mustered to cope with the genuinely historic tasks—to ensure changes which will take us to new forms of life, to the renewal of society within the framework of the socialist choice.

Naturally, equally sensitive is the issue of what the party's strategy and tactics are at this crucial stage of struggle for the goals of perestroika, what the CPSU itself should be like in order to come to grips with the new tasks, to be able to take part in the nationwide movement, cooperating with all pro-perestroika democratic forces.

Now that only several days separate us from the 28th party congress, we can say that in the run-up to the congress, communists, and not only communists but all strata of society, were actively involved in discussing the new role and place of the CPSU, the forms and methods of its work in the face of new realities, everything that engenders our revolutionary time.

The question of the activity of republican public organisations was raised in a new way in pre-congress discussions, along with the questions of the fate of socialism and the country, its short-term and distant prospects, the nature and role of various political and public institutions.

In this context, an interested discussion on whether there should be a Russian Communist Party or not was held not only among communists of primary party organisations of the Russian Federation, but also in the country.

The discussion of this, one of the cardinal issues of the life of the CPSU, the Russian Federation and the country on the whole eventually led to the conclusion that it is expedient and necessary to form a Communist Party of the Russian Federation.

It is fair to say that this view shaped up in rather keen discussions. This is quite understandable because, as I already emphasised, a very important decision is involved.

Nevertheless we can state today that the overwhelming majority of communists, party organisations and workers spoke out in favour of creating the party.

Therefore we together should take the final decision here in this hall. This is both within out competence and, at the same time, our common responsibility.

Any counterposing of Russia to the USSR and the Communist Party of the Russian Federation to the CPSU should be ruled out. All our thoughts and actions should be commensurate with historic reality and be as well considered as possible.

When uttering the word "Russia", we must always keep in mind the equally central phrase "the union". I think that this should be said in a straightforward way in the beginning of the work of our party conference, thus laying down the main condition for its constructive work.

And one more thing the conference must bear in mind—the real context in which it was convened. Both the party and all sections of society are aware of the current situation's acuteness. I would even say—aware of the dramatism of the in-depth changes we are living through. The socio-economic instability and perestroika's setbacks in some areas disturb us all of us most seriously. The main things required from the party, state bodies, socio-political organisations and from all of us today are sober evaluations and practical steps to quickly draw society out of the crisis. The most important thing now is to understand what is to be done.

Views are already being voiced that perestroika is to blame for everything. We have lived through five years of perestroika. Historically this is a very brief period. But a most profound change has been accomplished in a huge country during some 1,500 days, which is comparable to the largest and most radical events in world's history.

The question is frequently asked even now—what has perestroika yielded? The assessments are paradoxically contradictory. Some regard what has happened as the greatest revolutionary event, opening up broad prospects for humanising our society. Others regard these changes as the downfall, disintegration and collapse of everything—as a real apocalypse.

Some favour perestroika, while others already anathematize it. But this is not all. The desire is being witnessed recently to go over from statements to actions. Attempts are being made to muster dissatisfaction caused by curent difficulties and to exploit the actueness of the situation as a ram against perestorika and its true advocates, against those who are really concerned about the country's destinies. These actions by those who claim to be "spokesmen for the people" are by no means in the interests of the cause. It is now a well-known, tried and tested populist tactic by which some people make political capital.

No matter from what positions such attacks are launched, their true purpose is destructive. And they are, in fact, directed against the interests of the people, on behalf of whom such people allegedly speak up.

Yes, the situation in the country is not simple, it calls for urgent and long-term measures. We are preoccupied with this now and, obviously, all this cannot be ignored when we speak about what we have done over five years. But my understanding of the essence of what is taking place, my evaluations of the pace of perestroika—I emphasise my, because I was asked this question even at the Council of Delegations—so my evaluations are based not only on this. Although I can see all difficulties, take them close to heart, I also proceed from the analysis of the true scale of social and political transformations carried out over these years.

They create the basis for the confident advance of our society and the real improvement of people's lives, provided we act.

Let us analyse our economic system and compare transformations in recent years with attempts at reforms in previous decades. From the year 1953 when first changes in the agrarian policy were suggested to 1957 when councils of people's economy were formed, from the 1965 economic reform to the early eighties, we have been unable to get beyond mere alterations of the administrative and distributative system created by Stalin.

But even those tentative reforms have never been carried through. They were superficial and could not tackle cardinal problems of our development.

And now, within just one year, 1987, we created such prerequisites for reforms that greatly surpass everything achieved previously. And then, within two years of the implementation of the reform, we have actually finished a "preparatory school" which brought us to the shaping of a market economy, regulated in its social aspects.

Thus, within three years we have fully achieved everything which has been debated and experimented with over 30 odd years.

Let us address ourselves to the political system. From the moment the truth about Stalinism was spoken at the 20th congress of the Soviet Communist Party and the rehabilitation of the victims of reprisals started, society has been searching for guarantees against the repetition of lawlessness and looking for measures against the bureaucratism which shackled social energy.

And now, two years since the 19th party conference, we have achieved what the most progressive people of our country have been striving for for decades. The party has decided not to assume the functions of the state any longer. The division of power is now actual fact. Elections have become truly free.

We are actually on the threshold of true political pluralism. Glasnost has become an effective tool of progress. The notion of "social democracy" is no longer a mere propaganda phrase. It is reality.

Profound transformations in international relations are quite apparent and widely known. The epoch of exhaustive and pointless confrontation is over. As a result, the entire world situation has improved considerably. Our security strenghened and conditions for the cutting of defence spending were created in order to use them to improve people's standard of living.

Even if the Soviet troop withdrawal from Afghanistan was the only achievement of those years, it would have been enough to see the striking contrast with the decades when our involvement in bloody conflicts in others' lands was growing.

A most important principle of worldwide importance is involved here: We shall never allow anyone to interfere in our affairs and we unconditionally recognise the same right of choice of every people.

And, what is, perhaps, most important is that even though many things in present perestroika processes are hampered by the fact that the public consciousness is unprepared and marked by conservatism and narrow-minded attitudes which formed for decades within totalitarian ideology, nevertheless profound and, perhaps, most encouraging processes are taking take place also in this sphere.

Many of those present in the hall, just as myself, can say that this process proceeds extremely painfully, contradictorily, and unevenly in different social strata.

We witness fierce conflicts, adherence to different, even opposing concepts and views, and this, naturally, complicates the process of society's spiritual and moral rebirth, affects social transformations and leads to negative phenomena, which destabilises the situation.

This is so. But the main thing is the conclusions to be drawn from this and lessons to be learned for our present and future policy.

It is important to see a certain tendency, to support it and increase it in every way, to rid society consistently, through democratic forms, of everything that rolls it back, hampers movement, to rid this beneficial process of extremes of both ultra-right wing and leftist kinds.

A third of a century back, at the 20th congress, people were told the truth which shook our country, socialist society, the world communist movement. What we have learned about Stalinism was an insult to the ideals which inspired generations, which urged people to make the revolution, work on construction projects, defend the motherland, restore the war-ravaged country. It was an acute shock. And it would seem natural it prompted profound socio-political transformations.

And though there is no reason to say that nothing has changed from that time, hopes for profound social and political changes, regrettably, have not been justified, moreover, crimes began to be described as errors. Instead of profound reforms the same bureaucratic system was being "perfected." Instead of an ideological quest, Stalinist text-books were being rewritten. All this

caused deep wounds in society and in the souls of people. This poisoned ideology and aggravated international relations.

The logic of political struggle led from omissions in the correct assessment of stalin to his rehabilitation in some form or other. Political impotence and stagnation in every area inevitably resulted.

We can say now that what whole generations were striving for and could not achieve has been achieved in the ideological and political sphere within five years. Thus, despite all drawbacks, extremes, negative phenomena and losses, also those of ideological and moral nature, way has been cleared for the spiritual rebirth of man and society.

This is the way I look at things. I wish to repeat that this does not prevent me from seeing the acuteness of current problems and being aware of the need to adopt and implement major practical steps that would really alter the situation for the better and make people's life easier.

In short, without dramatising the situation and without retouching its political characteristics, we can say that we are living through the most responsible stage in perestroika's development.

Political, economic and spiritual roots are being broken, giving way to new, potentially inexhaustible forces, inherent in the nature of the socialist system.

The current situation requires special restraint and accurate assessments and actions.

We are passing through the "risk zone," when the new mechanisms of perestroika are not yet in gear and the old mechanisms have already been almost switched off or are running idle.

We should make the transition period as short as possible and turn all creative elements it may bring to society's benefit, simultaneously ensuring national civil accord.

We regard an accelerated transition to a regulated market economy as a way out of the current situation. We should finally overcome fluctuations in this respect.

We should grasp the essence of the problem and try to understand that we need the transition to the market not for its own sake but in order to reach new forms of economic life and introduce new, effective forms of economic activity and labour.

We need all this to achieve better results and satisfy the diverse requirements of the Soviet people.

It is only through the market that public requirements will be really revealed and the development of the sectors of public production and the services industry will be oriented in the right way, i.e. to the creation of what the people really need and in the needed amount.

We should carry out this transition without any detriment to living standards.

We should understand well the essence of the transition to a market economy and agree on this issue. There is no other choice.

I know that there are other considerations on this score. Everything that can help and accelerate this transition—especially, with regard to dates, forms and tactics—should be used.

In this sense, we should be open to any proposals. Only one thing is unacceptable—a return to the command-and-administrative system of economic management. That would be a misfortune and lead to deadlock.

In connection with this fundamental issue of perestroika, which we have begun to resolve in practice, I want to say the following.

Attempts are being made to impose an opinion on society that movement towards the market means a return to capitalism. One could not have invented anything more absurd.

Firstly, the market appeared at the dawn of civilisation, it is not an invention of capitalism. It has existed under socialism too, but, regrettably, in a distorted way.

Secondly, let us ask ourselves: Does the market contradict socialism if it helps raise the people's standard of living? No, it does not. Does it promote production? Yes, because it engages new powerful incentives for this.

Revealing through the market all possibilities for developing production and initiative, the state at the same time should defend people's interests and reliably ensure their social protection. I mean the right to work, living standards, ecology and the entire infrastructure directly serving man.

The market will encourage initiative, talent, conscientiousness, inventiveness and enterprise. It will deliver a powerful blow at wage-levelling mentality and practices, and, of course, it will be very inconvenient for loafers.

But does this contradict the principle of social justice? We have long proclaimed the slogan "From each according to his ability, to each according to his work," provided society ensures social guarantees and a certain standard of living.

Is there a danger that the market will give further boost to all kind of dealers, corrupted and sponging elements? Yes, there is such a danger. It is real. But the law must stand in the way of all this. We must bear this in mind and pass necessary laws, paving the way for transition to a market.

In the political sphere, we are also facing quite a few difficulties. Without analysing the entire range of problems, I would like to draw your attention to the following.

We are witnessing a growing gap betweenm the new dynamics of social, economic and political relations and the legislative basis for their regulation.

This gap affects the work of bodies of power, law and order, discipline and, the entire political situation in society.

This is why the legislative activity of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the newly elected Supreme Soviets of Constituent republics is of such importance now. They have a lot of work to do.

Everything should be done to make the law-making process advance us towards a rule-of-law state. Because where a political vacuum is created it is filled by all manners of shady forces.

This is one aspect of the issue. There ia also another, as important, aspect. It is not enough to have good laws meeting the objectives and tasks of perestroika and the interests of people and protecting them against arbitrariness and encroachments on their rights.

It is also important to have a reliable mechanism for fulfilling these laws. This refers to the Constitution, federal and republican laws.

I felt this particularly sharply at a meeting with leaseholders held in Kremlin recently. People said with alarmed: OK, necessary and very important laws on property, land and leasing have been adopted, but they actually do not work. Everything to a large extent remains in the old way, above all, due to the position of economic bodies, that part of senior executives which resist changes, new forms of economic life. One also has to act here undoubtedly!

All these range of problems, connected with the radical changes in the economy and politics, are making new demands on party work among the masses.

Ultimately, we will have the necessary laws and an effective mechanism for their implementation.

But the result largely depends on the attitude of people.

Much work has to be done to reshape peoples' mentality. It is now one of the most important tasks of the party. I must say: Those who underestimate the importance of the party's role in tackling this huge social task are largely mistaken, base their evaluations on delusions.

Comrades,

Even what I briefly described in my report, bearing in mind that after ten days a larger report will be presented to the 28th congress, which you will attend, makes it possible to judge the difficulties of perestroika. Since our history and the current revolutionary transformation are directly connected with the party's activity, it is quite understandable why the CPSU has found itself the focus of discussions in society.

Yes, the party has assumed responsibility for the failures of the past decades and today's hardships. This is why it has come under fire. It is difficult to object to this, and there are no grounds for objections. It is a different matter and we cannot agree when, along with the fair, justified criticism that is required for reforming the party and renewing the country in a democratic way, attempts are made to disparage indiscriminately everything that it has done and is doing and convince society that the CPSU should be liquidated. There are voices that are demanding repentance from the CPSU and its withdrawal from the political arena.

The provocative essence and instigatory character of such demands are obvious.

Naturally, we cannot fence off the fair criticism of the CPSU and primarily its leadership for past mistakes for which our people and society have paid a dear price.

Speaking of recent years, the party, its Central Committee and Politburo were unable to avoid miscalaculations and even mistakes, as they sought to overcome the heavy legacy of the past and launched transformations to renew society.

We did not always catch up with developments or find unequivocal political solutions to various problems.

I would like to mention specifically—this is not so much an accusation, but, probably, a justification of party committees—that they were not prepared effectively to operate during the democratisation and politicisation of society and new demands on communication with the masses. They failed to understand promptly the essence of ongoing changes and restructure the style and methods of work adequately.

As a matter of self-criticism, one has to admit that we underestimated the forces of nationalism and separatism that were hidden deep within our system and their ability to merge with populist elements, creating a socially explosive mixture.

Within the party itself, groups have emerged that question the correctness of the CPSU's principled course towards perestroika.

People are inquiring with anxiety: What is happening with the party, where is it going, what will it look like?

During the discussion before the congress, the CPSU Central Committee received thousands of resolutions, addresses and other documents from party organisations, which raised these issues with utter candour and concern.

We believe that the clashes, struggle of views is quite normal and even necessary for a political party. This is the most important condition for maintaining its political standards at a high level. In this sense, we welcome and encourage freedom of intellectual competiton within the CPSU. From these positions we approach the assessments of the discussion before the congress.

This unprecedented, keen and extensive inner-party debate centered on the CPSU Central Committee's draft platform for the 28th party congress and draft party rules, and a number of alternative platforms, of which the "democratic" and "Marxist" ones evoked the broadest response.

Documents adopted by the Moscow, Leningrad and other large territorial CPSU organisations, a conference of representatives of party organisations at the USSR Academy of Sciences and the All-Union Seminar of Secretaries of Party Committees at Higher Educational Establishments prompted a positive reaction in the country and within the party.

Our press has made a substantial contribution to the discussion. PRAVDA's "discussion leaflet" became essentially a pre-congress rostrum for communists and non-party people.

I think that the party's intellectual potential has been enhanced on the whole during this discussion. This alone marks its immense positive role.

Special working groups at the 28th congress organising commission, comprising delegates, are now completing work on new programme-setting drafts.

Probably for the first time in many years, this work was not isolated and restricted to the apparatus. It was conducted in an atmosphere of productive, democratic dispute and dialogue.

Representatives of alternative platforms took a direct part in the final stages of this work, which made it possible to remove some differences and pinpoint others for consideration at the congress.

You have received and managed to familiarise yourselves with the edited draft programme statement of the CPSU "Towards Humane, Democratic Socialism", as we now call this document. I think that delegates to the Russian forum will contribute their thoughts and suggestions. More editing will be done at the 28th congress.

The drafts underwent substantial changes upon the conclusion of the nationwide discussion. The programme statement is more laconic and substantive.

The draft statement has three, rather than the previous seven, sections. The first, entitled "Crisis of Society and the Party's Strategic Goals", reflects communists' proposals for making a clearer assessment of the current situation and analysis of the present socio-political and socio-economic crisis of the country, its underlying sources and objective causes, including during perestroika.

The alignment of political forces in the country, the place of the CPSU in the current political spectrum and its social base are outlined.

The principles of the party's world outlook were formulated, its adherence to the socialist choice and communist perspective were declared and a definition of humane, democratic socialism was given. All these are new points as compared to the initial draft.

The central idea of the proposed CPSU programme of action is to map out ways to overcome the country's acute crisis. There are, so to say, two aspects of the problem. Concrete anti-crisis measures have been proposed to revive the economy, prevent a drop in living standards, consolidate political power and eliminate hotbeds of inter-ethnic and social tension. But there are also long-term, strategic tasks for reforming our society.

As you remember, the draft platform of the CPSU Central Committee was mainly criticised for some measures resembling the notorious directives of state bodies, for not furnishing any mechanism to carry out the programmed goals. Now, I think, this shortcoming has been overcome.

It is stressed that the party will strive to achieve its goals by political methods only, relying on the conscientiousness and concerted actions of communists, including those employed at state institutions, by exercising its constitutional right to legislative initiative and by gaining the trust of the popular masses.

The draft of the programme statement and the CPSU rules contain many new provisions, which would radically reform the party, modify the party's role in society and democratise intra-party relations. The CPSU will be turned from an administrative body, imposing its will on society, into a political organisation, which will uphold its right to political leadership in free competition with other socio-political forces and through its theoretical and practical activity, its ability to propose constructive solutions to problems.

To promote the party's genuine democratisation, it is envisaged to renounce the formal nomenclature system and to hold alternative elections of secretaries, members of party committees and delegates to party forums by secret ballot and through free nomination of candidates.

The party rules will ensure the right of the minority to advocate its positions, including in the party mass media, and the right of individual communists and groups to express their ideological and political views in corresponding platforms.

The prerogatives of the principal party link—the primary organisation—will be substantially expanded. It will now have the right to independently determine the tasks and forms of its activity, the structure and numerical composition of its bodies and apparatus, the frequency and procedure of meetings and its political actions. They will have the last say in granting CPSU membership.

Party members will get the right to choose the primary organisation—production, territorial or any other—where they wish to work. It is planned to reduce party dues.

The congress draft documents devote attention to ensuring the independence of communist parties in constituent republics in all spheres of their organisational, personnel, publishing and financial activities.

The creation of a Communist Party of Russia is a major issue of the pre-congress discussion.

The CPSU Central Committee has received many thousands of letters from communists, as well as resolutions passed by major primary party organisations in districts, towns and regions, including Moscow, Leningrad, Sverdlovsk, Volgograd, and several autonomous republics—Komi, Karelia, Yakutia and others, supporting the creation of a Russian Communist Party.

In short, it is now obvious that the idea of organisationally rallying Russian communists into an independent party reflects the moods of most Russian communists.

The current socio-political situation in the country is prompting new arguments in favour of such a solution. This is connected primarily with the broadening and strengthening of the sovereignty of the Russian Federation, just as of the other union republics.

We are not starting from scratch. Russian sovereignty is already being substantiated. In September last year the plenary session of the Central Committee arrived at a conclusion about the advisability of establishing additional republican administration bodies in the Russian Federation, including administrative, economic, ideological, cultural, scientific ones, etc.

A strong impetus to the process was given by the first Congress of People's Deputies of the Russian Federation. The final steps towards building Russian statehood were taken. Four all-union building ministries were brought under the authority of the Russian Federation, a republican interior ministry was formed, and Russia's intellectual potential has begun to be unified.

A Russian academy of sciences has been founded and sectoral academies are being set up. A system of news organisations—which the Russian Federation, it must be stated straight, wanted—is taking shape.

It was decided to publish a "Women of Russia" magazine. The "Teacher of Russia" magazine will be published from 1991. The "Rodina" magazine has become the publication of the Supreme Soviet of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation. The question of publishing a socio-political journal has been resolved. A "Russia Speaks and Shows" programme has been launched on television, broadcasting for two hours daily.

From July 1 air time will be extended to five hours on Channel 1 and Channel 2. But it is clear that the specificity of Russia is such that it needs an independent republican television. It is essential to tackle this task without delay. I think there will be enough human will and material and other resources to solve the problem as soon as possible.

The structures of a new political system of the republic have begun to be formed. Steps in this direction were taken by establishing a Russian bureau of the CPSU Central committee, Russian independent trade unions, Komsomol (Young Communist League), and the founding of a Russian Federation state committee for nationalities problems. Other Russian socio-political organisations and associations are emerging.

Creating a Russian Communist Party is a logical extension of this process prompted by the country's political life. There is a mounting need to focus on the solution of the entire spectrum of matters concerning the development of the Russian Federation as an integrated state entity and to work out reference points acceptable to all people in Russia in the economic, cultural and ethnic development of the republic.

Ever new parties and movements suggesting various programmes for the revival of Russia are now entering political life. The sober, weighty voice of the Russian communists should clearly and confidently sound in the political plurality of voices. I am confident that they will succed in elaborating a well-considered stand with regard to both Russian problems proper and relationships with the Soviet Union and to defend it in inevitable political and parliamentary clashes.

In view of this, their ideological and organisational unification into two independent party is highly timely. Like any other political party, the Communist Party of Russia must suggest its programme to solve the pressing socio-economic problems, come forward with legislative initiatives, actively participate in law- making, press for its representation in higher state and local government bodies in the republic and pursue its policy through communists working in them.

The analysis of recent and more distant historical events suggests that without a powerful and influential republican organisation of communists, many possibilities in the sphere of socio-economic development remain untapped. If there had been such an organisation, perhaps much could have prevented, defended, saved and augmented.

At present it is essential to have a full idea of the true state of affairs and gain an understanding of the causes of the current situation in the republic.

It so happened that the Russian Federation bore the brunt of the blow by the command-and-administer system, which did not spare, of course, other regions of the union either.

The entire structure of centralised state administration of the country took shape in Russia, as if blended with the union structure in the economy and management.

Many state structures of the Russian Federation were for along time blended with and dissolved into the all-union ones. The unfinished nature of Russian statehood had a negative effect on the republic's affairs, social status and the morale of Russians.

Such a state of affairs led to the formation of a statehood that was truncated as compared to other republics, and to the curtailment of political and economic rights. Russia was almost unable to tackle matters of socio-economic development that are paramount to its people and handled them only through central agencies.

The majority of programmes, and primarily those connected with the utilisation of the republic's resources, were elaborated as all- union ones and in many respects did not take into account the interests of Russia's population.

The economy of Russia was little orientated towards the accomplishment of social tasks and the satisfaction of the population's requirements. At the same time it was overloaded with enterprises of heavy and producing branches of industry. Items of consumption comprise only 24 percent of the republic's industrial output.

Of course, it would be extreme to believe that until now the Russian Federation was not viewed as an integrated state entity altogether.

The Russian vector as an independent entity was always present in both the CPSU policy and the activities of the country's government agencies. But something else is also clear: Without shaping or recreating a number of elements that are lacking in the republic's state and socio-political administration, it is impossible to effect urgent socio-economic transformations.

Sharp and at times very great differences between the levels of economic and social development of autonomous entities, territories and regions have developed in the republic. Russian villages have run to neglect in a number of regions. The shortage of housing is acute and zones of ecological disaster have emerged.

I would like to emphasise one more aspect specifically: A considerable share of national income produced in the Russian Federation was used for defence needs.

During the long and tough military confrontation, that was an enforced and, perhaps, necessary measure. In a sense, the whole of Russia has been and remains the mainstay of the entire state. This inevitably told on the economic development of the republic, towns and villages, and on the entire social sphere.

But the situation is now radically changing. New political thinking is yielding fruit, making it possible to have a different approach to the choice of priorities in the socio-economic policy.

I visualise a constructive role for the Russian Communist Party—as a component of the CPSU, it will serve as one of the union's supports. I resolutely disagree with those who seek the salvation of Russia in isolation, seclusion and even withdrawal from the USSR.

Does someone think, maybe, that Russia outside the union would develop more successfully? This is nothing more than an illusion. How can one make a rapid breakthrough in economic and social spheres without combining the potentials of the republics or without using the advantages of intra-union cooperation and division of labour that took shape over decades of joint life and work.

Those who are prepared to partition the union, to cut on the raw, so to speak, and to disrupt years-old economic ties fail to realise that all this would inevitably lead to the weakening of the russian federation itself. Such attempts are a crime to Russia and to its people. I think Russian communists are able to correctly evaluate such attempts.

This problem has not only economic but also deep spiritual aspects, for Russia can be and is distinctive and great only amid other cultures and languages, imbued with their vivifying power and being historically connected with them, enriching them and being enriched by them in return.

Tear this intertwined root system, and it will not be quite Russia, or not quite the same Russia that was bequeathed to us and that should be handed carefully to our descendants. We all, inhabitants of Russia, should think hard and remember this.

During the initial stage of the establishment of new economic relations and the development of self-management and self-financing, there emerged trends in some places towards territorial isolation and economic seclusion, towards the prevalence of local interests and the desire to create a local market.

Vital economic ties are jeopardised, decades-old forms of the territorial divison of labour, its specialisation and cooperation are being disrupted.

I do not want to blame people, managers and work collectives for these occurrences. I would like to draw the conclusion that reforms should be encouraged and work collectives should develop independence. They should be given an opportunity to work effectively and receive corresponding results to improve living standards. This is the cornerstone.

I think that the Communist Party of the Russian Federation will be able to counter the economic separatism of regions, national seclusion and the transformation of Russia into a conglomerate of appanages. It will more quickly find ways to accelerate radical economic transformations, at the threshold of which we are currently standing.

The need for an independent Communist Party of Russia is determined by the growing importance of the national factor. The peoples inhabiting Russia, as well as our entire country, are very different.

Theoretically, we have always known this, of course. But in practice, even the task of building relations with each people in a specific, sensitive way has not been raised in earnest for decades.

A standard unified approach prevailed, which was presented as internationalism in action. Moreover, the task of merging nations was put forward in theory, policy and, regrettably, in practice as one of the topical tasks.

We have come to realise that the multifaceted forms of society's life is an advantage. The democratisation of the economy, the diversity of forms of ownership and the deepening of political reform and self-management principles cannot but give rise to diversity in the development of republics and peoples.

Relying on the economic and intellectual potential gained, on historical experience, ethnic traditions and lifestyle, they receive an opportunity to contribute to the progress of Soviet society and all mankind.

Surely, this diversity should have a certain nucleus. We are faced with organically blending the spontaneous aspirations towards national self-awareness from below and working to renew socialism.

We ourselves should realise and convince the Soviet people that this is, in fact, a dual process.

Attempts to set the national idea against the socialist idea are ruinous to both.

True national revival is impossible without a great spiritual social goal. Socialism is firm only when it grows out of the soil of national life, not when it is imposed from above or from aside.

Only given this approach, will we succeed in creating a truly humane and democratic system and turn the multiethnic factor into a catalyst of strength for society and the state.

It is naive to assume that this will happen by itself. The importance of a party that fully realises the dialectical interrelationship between truly patriotic aspirations and values of internationalism, that holds dear the interests of national development, its socialist goals and universal human values has profoundly grown in present-day conditions.

The independence of the Russian Communist party does not rule out, but envisages, room for the political initiative of the party organisations that comprise it.

Broadly speaking, the task is to turn the Russian Federation into a federation of peoples not only in name, but also in essence. There is every reason to assume that the party of Russian communists will facilitate through political means the establishment of a new level of independence for autonomies.

Comrades, the status of the Russian Communist Party in the republic's political life and its authority will be largely determined by the extent to which it facilitates the creation of an atmosphere of humanity and devotes attention to man's problems, culture, education and national character in the republic.

The point at issue is not merely the revival of the best Russian traditions, but the creation of a cultural environment in which each one is an individual. This is our undistorted historical memory, national consciousness and morality.

In this context, I would like to express profound gratitude to the Russian intelligentsia, known for their selfless devotion and self-negating services to the people.

We now need to solve a set of vary acute problems relating to the restoration of what was destroyed, the revival of temporarily lost layers of russian culture and the culture of other peoples. Here, too, communists can play a constructive role by helping collect and rally all the spiritual forces in our society.

The Russian Federation is a rich constellation of its peoples' ethnic cultures. The basic tasks here are to ensure the free development of each and every culture, and in some areas to actually recreate national traditions and revive small towns and their culture. The task is to beef up the cultural potential of Siberia and the Far East and to overcome the backwardness of rural areas. We must recreate in Russia the humanitarian structures which are no longer there—research institutions, encyclopedia publishers, ethnographic and folklore centres. Conditions must be created to help the individual adapt to the requirements of the scientific and cultural revolution and to stimulate full-blooded scientific activity. We must ensure the protection of intellectual property and avoid a brain drain. We need an effective system of identifying priority directions for science, state orders and purpose-oriented subsidies.

It is important to make active use of the law and legislative initiative. The Supreme Soviet, the Russian Federation government and local councils should adopt decisions to boost the status of the spiritual sphere in the republics, to ensure its material and legal protection, the dignity of talent, and to recreate the traditions of enlightenment and selfless devotion.

Yet another argument favouring the organizational and political establishment of the Communist Party of Russia: The turbulent process of concentrating real power in the hands of soviets (councils) is under way in the republic and throughout the country.

A wide range of political organisations and movements has emerged. It is perfectly clear, as I have already pointed out, that the political life in the republic would be defective without an independent communist party.

A communist party must become an integral part of Russia's new social and political system. Proceeding from an understanding of the extraordinary importance

of society's political and economic stability, the Communist Party of Russia will pursue its policy with respect to the workers movement, trade unions, the younger generation and peasants. In this way, it will respond appropriately to the challenge of its political opponents.

Comrades! I have considered those factors, which are providing a powerful impetus to the drive to form, within the Soviet Communist Party, an independent Communist Party of Russia. But it is also important to realise the entire complexity of the dialectics underlying this problem.

The main difficulties are how to bind the organisational identification of Russian communists with the vital necessity of rallying and consolidating the Soviet Communist Party as a whole and how to combine the possible strengthening of isolationist tendencies in Russia with our historic responsibility for the preservation of the unity and integrity of the Soviet Union as a great world power.

In order to resolve these questions, a historic choice has to be made, which will determine for many years to come the fate of our party, the fate of Russia and the whole country, and to certain extent the fate of world civilization, taking into account the role the Soviet Union now plays in it.

It is impossible to overlook the fact that we have to make decisions as a sharp political struggle is waged in the country. In this struggle, some forces are seeking to turn the issue of the Russian Communist Party into an instrument with which to reach specific political objectives, into a trump card.

It is surprising to observe how people whose political rhetoric lacked the very notion of Russia only a year or so ago, are vociferous champions of Russia's interests today.

It is no secret that attempts have been made to organise the Russian Communist Party on the amorphous base of a parliamentary party. It is clear that this approach would lead to transforming it into a shapeless club, devoid of actual political potential. Such proposals seek to explode the Soviet Communist Party from within, to remove it from the political arena.

Another extreme in the range of approaches to the issue is the call to revive the Communist Party of Russia and base it on the dogmatical rejection of perestroika transformations in the country and the party.

Supporters of such views count on turning the Russian Communist Party against perestroika, which is regarded by them as a revision of Marxism and their own ideas of socialism, which have long since lost all connection with reality.

Without entering into polemics with these viewpoints, I would like to note one thing: As life changes, so do the specific conditions of political work, hence changes in the party are unavoidable if it wants to follow the mainstream of life and not to be cast ashore. Attempts to brake the party renewal are intended to eventually destroy the Soviet Communist Party, just like calls to dilute its ideological and organisational foundations.

We must be very careful in discerning these "Russia-related encroachments", we must clearly differentiate between the healthy drive in favour of creating a communist party in Russia, prompted by the actual problems and requirements of the republic, and speculations around Russia's problems for the sake of attaining goals inimical to Russia, the party and the Soviet Union.

We are facing a historic choice. Apparently, given present circumstances, the decision to set up the Russian Communist Party should be positive. It is necessary to find ways to strengthen the CPSU, and draw party ranks closer together. The Russian Communist Party should become the fulcrum in the party's struggle against separatist, nationalist and schismatic forces. To achieve this it is necessary to ensure the ideological, political and organisational unity of the Russian Communist Party on the basis of programme documents and uniform CPSU rules.

We should ensure that the Russian Communist Party becomes an organic part of the CPSU, a united CPSU. Naturally, republican communist parties should have maximum freedom of action. The 28th congress should be asked to discuss organizational guarantees, ensuring equality to communist parties of all union republics within a united CPSU, and discuss mechanisms to ensure democratic equality. Communists of all republican parties will appreciate this initiative.

A proposal has been made to include Communist Party leaders from all union republics in the future presidium of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee or set up a special Council of Representatives from republican communist parties with broad powers.

However, this is just one proposal, and we need a package. This should be considered and discussed at this conference as well. I believe we should allow the centre to repeal decisions taken by the republican parties if they contradict CPSU rules, the centre should also be granted direct access to the party masses, primary party organisations, given the right to hold party-wide referendums and discussions, irrespective of what this or that republican party organisation thinks on the issue. This will balance and benefit a united Communist Party and equality.

The new draft CPSU rules should be carefully analysed with regard to setting up the Russian Communist Party. No doubt, it should now be amended. The Council of Delegations discussed clear-cut questions, participants made suggestions. I believe we will hear them from speakers at the conference, this is why I decided against listing them in my report.

Under the current democratic transformations, it is important to consolidate the centre's right to guide the work of parliamentary groups or CPSU factions in union representative bodies.

Perhaps, taking into account the world experience of political parties, we should think about a special entry in the party rules banning the formation of any factions that would be independent of the party's leading bodies. In general this is a very important and subtle problem, and it is essential to get to the root of it.

The possibility of organisational identification between groups inside the CPSU Central Committee on the basis of affiliation with this or that republican Communist Party should also be ruled out statutorily.

All of these are trifles, as it would seem, but such trifles in certain conditions may acquire decisive importance.

At the forthcoming 28th congress we must find ways to determine the status of the CPSU Central Committee and the status of the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the union republics. All these are resolvable matters and they should be discussed at the congress.

In order to accomplish its tasks the Communist Party of the Russian Federation will form its own central committee and a staff subordinate to it. At a time when the entire CPSU is being renewed, their functions should also be determined anew.

The structure of party bodies should not duplicate the structure of the soviets (councils). We should also decide on the party's name. It seems the following point of view prevails: The party of the communists of the Russian Federation should be named the Communist Party of the Russian Federation (applause) This was practically supported by the council of delegations.

Comrades,

At the beginning of the conference we already spoke of the organisational aspect of establishing a Communist Party of the Russian Federation. When preparing for the conference, the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee at first failed to take fully into account all opinions and suggestions from communists of Russia on that score. A democratically formed preparatory committee helped strengthen the living bond with local party organisations.

Working groups, with delegates invited to participate, prepared a report, draft resolutions and other documents. We have every right to say that the russian party conference was prepared collectively, with the large-scale involvement of party activists from the local level.

The opinions of the communists of Russia, the preparatory committee and the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee having been taken into account, it is being proposed to give this conference the status of a constituent congress and to form a Communist Party of the Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic.

The credentials of delegates, elected simultaneously to the CPSU Congress and the Russian Party Conference, enable them to take any decision on the organisational identification of the party. The conference, represented by plenipotentiary delegates of all communists, has the right to declare itself the supreme body of the party organisation of the republic.

It is also being proposed to elect a central committee, a politburo, first secretary and secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Russia and a control-and-auditing commission.

A different point of view was also expressed about the time frame for the organisational identification of the Communist Party of Russia and for the election of the party's leading bodies. I must bring it to your attention. It will certainly be voiced in speeches. We must exchange views on this score.

This view supports holding a constituent congress in two phases. During the first phase, prior to the 28th Congress of the CPSU—to decide on the formation of a communist party of the republic, elect the first secretary of the Central Committee and form an organising committee or a council of representatives of party organisations of Russia to conduct practical work, elaborate proposals and documents and determine candidacies for the leading bodies of the communist party.

During the second stage of the congress—to discuss matters concerning the practical work of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation, identify candidacies, get better acquainted with these people and then elect the party's leading bodies.

I did my best to bring to your attention the second point of view, which was also thoroughly substantiated. But, as I already said, the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee and the preparatory committee declared in favour of electing all leading bodies of the Communist Party of the Russian Federation at this conference, i.e. before the 28th Congress of the CPSU. A meeting of representatives of delegations also took up this attitude. The conference should decide on these matters.

Comrades,

I already said that our conference is an important contribution to preparations for the 28th Congress of the CPSU, on the decisions of which our people have set great hopes.

I think the 28th congress will adopt programme documents that will serve as the basis for possible genuine consolidation of all sound forces of the working class, farmers and intellectuals. It is their interest that the CPSU must express and defend, constantly taking counsel with all the people.

Our party is the party of the socialist choice. Its goal is to create a society of humane, democratic socialism. I see the main task of the CPSU during the current complex transitional period as a persistent search for ways to achieve civil concord and combine the country's constructive forces to renew society.

In its policy the party is called upon to react sensitively to the will of the people of the multi-ethnic motherland and to pursue a constructive policy to strengthen the statehood of the sovereign republics, their political and economic independence and adhere to genuine, not just declared, centralism and uphold the integrity of the USSR within the framework of a jointly elaborated union treaty.

It is necessary to say unequivocally at the congress that the CPSU—without any reservations and compromises—rejects the ideology and practice of Stalinism that trampled underfoot the spiritual and ethical ideals of socialism.

The CPSU firmly favours the full power of the soviets and government by the people and renounces administrative and economic functions, claims on monopoly, and any attempts at ideological compulsion.

The party will seek society's support in the realisation of socialist values through persuasion, political work among the masses, and parliamentary discussions within the framework of the Constitution and laws.

The CPSU is open to dialogue with democratic and public movements and to compromise in the interests of political stability and civil peace in our society.

Concluding my speech, I once again call on you to launch a creative and responsible discussion and to realise that an immense responsibility for the destiny of Russia and the destiny of the Soviet Union, devolves on all of us—delegates to the party conference and to the forthcoming congress of the CPSU.

Osadchiy Delivers Preparatory Committee Report

LD1906211790 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1753 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Deputy I. Osadchiy at the RSFSR Communist Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, Moscow, on 19 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrades, when the issue of giving the floor to the preparatory committee was being resolved, we were put—perhaps, through an inadvertent slip—in the same group with the Marxist and the Democratic Platforms. I am clarifying that we are not a separate platform; rather, we are representatives of all the oblast, kray, and district party organizations of Russia elected at their plena. Naturally, we reflect the mood of the communists of the respective party organizations. We do not support some different platform. For us, the CPSU platform, in its basic features, is the essence of our moods, approaches, and principles. But, one should take into account the fact that, it goes without saying, we criticize its weak points, contradictions, and shortcomings. Yet another clarification is required here, too. Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, chairman of the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee, is the actual leader of the preparatory committee. Comrades, Russian communists have reached the completion stage of their organizational unification. The formation of a republican communist party organization is a significant political event in the life of the party and the country. It brings in hopes and possibilities for concentrating the creative powers of the people for the fight aimed at taking Russia and the whole country out of a nationwide crisis. This constitutes the breakthrough nature of the present moment.

In a situation which to a considerable degree resembled the current one, Lenin wrote in the article, "Crisis in the Party," in January 1921: One must have the courage to face the bitter truth—the party is sick; the party has a fever. As a way to a quick recovery, Lenin suggested all the members of the party should soberly and very carefully analyze the situation and find ways out of the blind alley. That advice of Lenin is also very topical today. If the CPSU finds the stamina for putting its own house and every party organization in order, mastering the situation in the country, determining scientifically based measures for getting out of the crisis it has found itself in, then, we are confident, the working people will again perceive it as their political vanguard. A preparatory committee for preparing this conference in accordance with the Central Committee March plenum was formed democratically, from below. Plena of the kray, oblast, and district party committees elected their representatives to it. The first joint meeting of the preparatory committee and the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee chaired by Comrade Gorbachev took place on 3 April. A commission and four working group were formed at it, consisting of members of the preparatory committee for preparing documents of the conference that opened today.

The working groups and commissions were headed by members of the Russian Bureau of the party's Central Committee. The preparatory committee set its task to include not only organizational matters, but the expression in generalized form of the opinions of communists on ideological, theoretical, and political problems. However, the committee came up against great difficulties in its work. Individual working groups worked virtually without their leaders—the members of the Bureau of the Russian Central Committee—at their own risk. An extremely complex situation developed at times, and we had to act harshly and sometimes by means of ultimata. Sometimes we got the impression that we were a democratic cover, and not a working body preparing for the conference. At our 3 April sitting we agreed that an appeal to the communists of Russia, defining the tasks and goals of the forthcoming Russian party conference, would be published in the next few days. We prepared

the appeal, but even now it has not seen the light of day. It was also agreed at that time the sittings of the preparatory committee would be systematic; that condition has not been implemented in practice either. Individual working groups did not start work before the middle of May, a month ago. The absence of the due level of organization and coordination led to the enforced inactivity of several working groups of the preparatory committee. This is explained primarily by the long-drawn-out vagueness of the CPSU leadership's position on the matter of the expediency of establishing a Communist Party in Russia. The Russian Bureau of the Central Committee was virtually inactive on this point too. This caused well-founded bewilderment among the republic's communists and intensified the wavering of some of the republic's communists. [applause]

At the same time, organizing committees to prepare the founding congress of the republic's Communist Party were already operating in the Russian Federation, in Kuybyshev, Leningrad, Novosibirsk, Gorkiy, Sverdlovsk, and other cities. In essence, these were the first attempts to solve the fundamental issues of party construction from below. The first stage of the organizing congress of Russia's communists took place at the end of April. Its participants elected an organizational bureau to coordinate work on completing the organizational arrangements for it—in other words, on establising the Communist Party of Russia. At the second stage of the congress, a number of political resolutions and statements were adopted. On the proposal of the working groups of the preparatory committee, representatives of the organizational bureau of the Leningrad congress were brought in for the preparation of draft documents, which had a positive effect in our conference. All this was done for the purpose of the unity of forces in the party which advocate firm adherence to socialism and communist ideas.

The preparatory committee's work included comrades who profess the views of the Democratic and Marxist platforms. Naturally, these views were also taken into account in our work, in the process of arguments and discussions. The democratic formation of the preparatory committee yielded fruit. Work to prepare the Russian Party Conference received the input of the living breath of the Russian party in the provinces, the pain and hopes and the aspirations and initiative of communists, primary party organizations and the laboring strata of our multi-national republic. The majority of members of the preparatory committee worked in a variety of ways with communists in party organizations in the regions. They appeared in the mass media and at party assemblies and conferences, studied the feelings and proposals of communists and reflected them in the draft documents.

Let me note that all the draft resolutions and documents were sent out and distributed to all delegates ten days ago. Complaints that a number of delegates have not received these documents have been heard here. I think this has happened because of the same lack of coordination and organization of which I have already spoken earlier.

In all fairness, one should mention the feedback of the preparatory committee's members was very uneven. In material for the report, which we also prepared on behalf of the preparatory committee and in all draft documents, we strived to convey views and wishes of the party masses as much as possible. Many communists have addressed a serious reproach to the CPSU leadership, especially to the leadership of the Russian Bureau of the Central Committee, for the fact that the party has been put in the position of someone who has to catch up with others and through this constantly misses the initiative and fails to properly influence the development of events and divert them to the appropriate channel. [applause]

In the communists' view, the party, which was in a pre-crisis state, has very soon found itself overcome by a crisis, increasingly losing its vigor, surrendering its positions without a fight, losing the authority and the role of the political vanguard of the Soviet people. In the last two years, however, its unenviable role of a recorder of events has become especially obvious. Instead of strengthening all the links of the party and determining its strategy and tactics corresponding to the given political moment, the CPSU leadership has left it, unarmed, in trenches under the concentrated fire of anti-socialist forces, which have promptly coordinated their actions. Some media organs and quite a contradictory and sometimes unpredictable policy of the party leadership have played not a small part in the consolidation of those anti-socialist forces. [applause] In our view, the situation in the republic and, in particular, at the First Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, would have been different if a Russian Communist Party had been set up before the election campaign had started and had come out as a single entity in the ideological and organizational aspects...[interrupted by applause] with a clear platform. In the conditions of democratization and glasnost, which have not only brought about the freedom of speech, rallies, and gatherings in the country but also anarchic permissiveness and willfulness, in the conditions of real political pluralism and the rapid formation of a multitude of various political parties, organizations, movements and fronts, the need to urgently solve the issue of setting up a party of Russian communists was as pressing as ever.

That was not done in good time, and for that reason processes and events went past, uncontrolled. It must also be said the preparatory committee's work, the initiatives of communists, and heated discussions in party organizations were for a long time not covered in the central mass media. Only in the last few days have SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and PRAVDA started paying some attention to it. There was virtually no discussion of the structure of the party of the communists of Russia, of its ideological and organizational foundations or of the party's name. This is why there are so many unresolved issues.

Comrades, one result of the preparatory committee's work is the material for the report, for a Leninist Party, for Socialism and a communist outlook, which, on the unanimous decision of the conference of representatives of delegations on 16 June, should have been distributed to each conference participant today as a document. However, the will of hundreds of conference participants was again not fulfilled. For the sake of justice, it must be said that several fundamental theses expressed by us in the document we produced were taken into account by the rapporteur and reflected today in Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's speech.

A document was also produced on the most typical observations and proposals made by communists on the draft platform. We insisted it should be duplicated and distributed to delegates. It did not happen: Our request was not carried out, either. That document has now been handed to Comrade Medvedev's commission for the 28th party congress.

We prepared drafts of those documents which, in the opinion of the preparatory committee, are necessary for the conference to work in an organized manner. Each thesis in our documents, including this statement, which I am delivering on behalf of the preparatory committee, was born in heated arguments. We tried to bring together and express in generalized form the stances of communists representing various platforms, positions, and approaches. An analysis of the feelings in the party organizations of the republic indicates that an absolute majority of communists are firmly for the establishment of a Communist Party in Russia before the 28th party congress. [applause]

As for what the Communist Party of the Russian Republic should be like, it has to be said that the answer here is not clear-cut. There are various opinions. There are people in the party who are trying to turn it into a social-democratic, reformist party along parliamentary lines. There are aspirations for the party to dissolve itself altogether—in other words, to end it all in suicide. There are also other opinions. However, the feelings and proposals of the majority of communists indicate unambiguously that only a Leninist-style Communist Party built on Leninist foundations can extricate Russia from the crisis. [applause]

While freeing ourselves from old and new dogmas alike, we must not cast aside our methodological and theoretical heritage, but develop it dialectically, taking account of new conditions. We are not able and do not have the right to ignore the feelings and proposals of the majority of communists and all those Soviet people who prize the values of socialism. The dogmatic approach to Marxist-Leninist theory has inflicted so little harm on our country, but the alarm of communists at the use of the pretext of combatting it to impose the thesis of the de-ideologization of Soviet society today is well-founded. That thesis is, in itself, groundless, for history does not know a single deideologized state. Every political party is guided by a particular ideology and, naturally, supports, defends and conducts propaganda for certain ideological values and shapes social consciousness. [applause]

The Communist Party in Russia can become a party of action, a party of the fight for the interests of the working people, if the whole diversity of opinions and approaches is directed toward creating and maintaining both ideological and organizational unity. We recognize only one type of centralism in the party: the democratic type, when the center acts under the control of the party masses and expresses their will. [applause]

Major decisions affecting the interests of the whole party must either be adopted at party congresses or be confirmed by a party referendum, by balloting in primary party organizations. [applause]

Only under such conditions can one avoid, in particular, a situation when a sharp turn in the country's life—including the one that is taking shape today, a turn towards the market—might be implemented on behalf of the party without a party decision and even without consulting the party. After all, the responsibility for the consequences will rest with the entire party and not only with those communists who hold important posts in the top echelons of the state leadership. [applause] In our views, many laws and program documents are not working precisely because they are being elaborated at the top and handed down to the lower levels without reflecting the pulse of life; naturally, these documents are not born in the midst of the people and its will is not taken into consideration. [voices from the audience: Time is up!]. I am finishing, comrades.

Naturally, speaking about many problems which have arisen in the course of the work of the preparatory committee, I would like to mention also that Lenin's behest to the effect that workers and peasants occupy in all the guiding organs of the state and the party the place they occupy in society's life should be put into practice at last. Hence, naturally, the need to elect as many representatives of ordinary workers and peasants as possible to the composition of the central organs of the Russian Communist Party. [applause] A high proportion of the most politically aware and active communists from workers and peasants in leading party organs, up to the Central Committee, will be a reliable guarantee of the ideological strength and vigor of the party and will prevent it from degenerating again into a bureaucratic tool. [applause]

Comrades, Russia faces complex problems. The situation is extremely acute. You, delegates, you, participants, must sort the situation out, naturally with all the due historic responsibility, and to answer the questions that are on the minds of Russian communists. On behalf of the preparatory committee, allow me to wish you all to work fruitfully bearing in mind this historic responsibility. [applause]

Lysenko, Tyulkin Address Russian Conference

LD1906175390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1527 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by correspondent Igor Zorin]

[Excerpt] [Zorin] Delegate Lysenko, senior lecturer from the Moscow Aviation Institute, read a coreport on behalf of the Democratic Platform. He stated that, having started perestroyka, the CPSU is putting a brake on it today and its prestige among the people is falling. Lysenko then criticized the position of the organizing congress for setting up the Russian Communist Party which had been held in Leningrad. Here is an excerpt from his speech: [Lysenko] I would now like to briefly describe our positions, those of the Democratic Platform. Our main idea is that there is a need to set up a party which, together with the Russian parliament, would start rejuvenating our republic, which would be able to carry out radical economic and political reform in the RSFSR and to ensure an efficient economy, social protection of citizens, and national concord. In order to enjoy prestige and the trust of the citizens of our republic, such a party should voluntarily give up all of its political privileges and hand over voluntarily to the people a major part of the property that does not belong to the CPSU today.

Such a party will win the right to political leadership solely through universal parliamentary elections in an honest competition with other political parties. In this connection, it is odd to hear from this rostrum words to the effect that a parliamentary party is an absolutely worthless and bad party. Politologists know that in all civilized parliamentary states all the parties are parliamentary ones, except those banned by law. Therefore, I think that in this case arguments about definitions do not bring us closer to the truth.

Further, comrades, we think that there is the need today to raise the issue of giving up the foundations of the Communist Party which are invalid today and pull us back. The Democratic Platform considers that today we should not put forward as our goal the CPSU's utopian goal that used to be proclaimed in the preceding years. We think that it is necessary to eliminate the monopoly of a single ideology. It is necessary to eliminate the party's monopoly on power and to give up the foundations of a totalitarian party such as democratic centralism, the territorial-production and unitary principle of the party's structure, the nomenclature system and the old name that has been compromised.

[Zorin] Delegate Tyulkin appeared on the platform. I think that you will not relate unambiguously to it. Listen to him, please.

[Tyulkin] According to our point of view, a unique kind of mandatory, I would call it new, restructuring dogmatism, has been established in the party today on a whole range of issues. Where before there was no alternative to developed socialism and the thrifty economics of intensification, now there exists no alternative to that version of perestroyka which is being put into practice—which was precisely what was said at the initiative congress. Certain people are moved, well, how we have developed democratic processes [sentence as heard].

What pluralism? Members of our party lead both the left-wingers and the right-wingers, both the United Front of Working People and the People's Front of Working People, both those who are for communism and those who are against communism—all of them are members of our party. [applause]

The person who observes this from the top and says: Good! Pluralism! is the party's main ideologist. [applause] Of course, today the situation on the issue of formation of the Russian Communist Party is not what it was, for instance, on 3 April, when the majority of members of the Russian Bureau and Central Committee secretaries were categorically against it. Now, already, the majority has made its opinion. The majority is for it.

But today there will be many speeches against it, and will put all kinds of checks on this process, attempt to draw out elections to the leading party bodies until later and will put forward many reasons. Because someone pronounces the word Russian badly. [applause] And, secondly, they frankly do not want to pronounce the word communist. Comrade communists of our republic, unite! [applause]

Lysenko Presents Democratic Platform Report

LD2006081190 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1817 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by Deputy Lysenko at the Russian Soviet Federated Soviet Republic Communist Party Conference in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 19 June—recorded]

[Text] Esteemed comrade: I agree with the Kuybyshev delegate who spoke here, that for every Russian there is probably no problem like that of the revival of our republic. In this connection, I think that whatever we say and whatever party problems we examine, we must first of all think about what response this will bring in our republic and in our country as a whole. And, in this connection, I think that an analysis and examination of the general political and economic situation is extremely important for the further work of our conference.

Having begun perestroyka, the CPSU has today in fact slowed down and become the main brake on those processes that it initiated. Experiencing a profound political crisis, the CPSU today is rapidly losing the support of the population, both in the country and in our republic.

Comrades, I participated in the March elections of RSFSR people's deputies, and the first question which was put by many audiences was whether you are a CPSU member or not. And if you say yes, I am a communist,

then immediately there is a buzz in the hall with cries, of: We will no longer elect communists to the soviets.

Quite recently, at our congress of Russian deputies, I approached the confederation of labor, the Novokuznetsk delegation, and I tried to seek out communists among the board of that confederation in order to invite them to the all-Union conference of the Democratic Platform. I had a hard job finding communists there, for, as I was told by representatives of the country's biggest workers' association, they have left the CPSU and do not intend to maintain any kind of relations with that party any longer.

Comrades, these are very serious things, and we have to think today about where we are going and what we, the delegates to this forum can undertake in order to change the situation. I think that a moment of truth is dawning for the CPSU. It has to determine whether it is going to be able to reform and change itself radically, or if it is going to depart from the political arena, whether it will be able to become a genuinely modern party, or if it is to remain as a party on the old foundations that have today been rejected in practice by history. I do not think there is any third way today. It could only, perhaps, be the path of going back, returning to the old, rigid ways of the 1930s and 1940s.

I totally support the declaration of the first Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies on sovereignty and the decree on power adopted as a basis yesterday. I am in solidarity with the opinion of the majority of Russian communists about the need to create a new political party of Russian communists in the republic. The Democratic Platform of the CPSU is concerned, first and foremost, about what kind of party this is to be, what principles it will be founded upon, whether it will look forward or will return to the past. And here we clearly see three fundamental positions, three fundamental concepts about the creation of the new Russian party. The first position was stated clearly at the Leningrad initiative congress for the Russian Communist Party. At that congress it was said plainly that perestroyka is an antisocialist and antiworker policy, that a revisionist Central Committee has departed from the decisions of the 27th party congress, that under the guise of democratization of the CPSU, a program for its liquidation is being developed. By way of a positive program, it is proposed that the Bolshevist character of our party as a political vanguard of the working class of town and country be revived, and that we return to the old, pre-perestroyka methods of resolving social problems.

Our party's Central Committee is taking up a slightly different position, aimed at establishing yet another apparatus-based, bureaucratic, republic party or organization, the fifteenth, with the very same oblast, city, and rayon committees but a new Russian nameplate. Comrades, I am profoundly convinced that if we leave it like that, with small amendments, neither young people nor nonparty members will join this party, for today, as you know, the number of resignations from the CPSU is far greater than the numbers who are joining it.

In this regard, I would like to express a view concerning the preparation of our Russian conference. It has been said here that all forces in the party and all platforms were brought in for the preparation. Unfortunately, that is not the case. The Democratic Platform was not brought in for the preparation of the Russian conference, and it was mainly representatives of the party apparatus and the Leningrad organizing congress who worked on the preparatory committee. The comrades who have seen the documents prepared by the preparatory committee are, I think, in complete solidarity with, in any event, the Moscow delegation's view that they are documents which in fact represent the positions of the United Front of Working People. It is for that very reason, I believe, that they did not appear in this hall today as official documents at our conference.

Now I would like to briefly describe our positions, those of the Democratic Platform. Our main idea is that there is a need to set up a party which, together with the Russian parliament, would start rejuvenating our republic, and which would be able to carry out radical economic and political reform in the RSFSR and to ensure an efficient economy, social protection of citizens, and national concord. To achieve prestige and the trust of the citizens of our republic, it must be a party that voluntarily gives up all its political privileges and voluntarily hands over to the people a major part of the property that does not today belong to the CPSU. It is a party that will win the right to political leadership solely in universal parliamentary elections in an honest competition with other political parties. In this regard, it is odd to hear from this rostrom words to the effect that a parliamentary party is an absolutely worthless and bad party. The thing is that all politologists know that in all civilized parliamentary states all the parties are parliamentary ones, except those banned by law. Therefore, I think that in this case arguments about definitions do not bring us closer to the truth.

Further, comrades, we think it is necessary today to raise the issue of giving up the foundations of the Communist Party that are invalid today and that pull us back. The Democratic Platform believes that today we should not put forward as our goal the CPSU's utopian goal that used to be proclaimed in preceding years. We think it is necessary to eliminate the monopoly of a single ideology. It is necessary to eliminate the party's monopoly on power and to give up the foundations of a totalitarian party such as democratic centralism, the territorial-production and unitary principle of the party's structure, the nomenclature system, and the old name, which has compromised itself.

Our opinion is that the new party's social base must not be just hired workers, not just the poor strata of the population, but it must also include the qualified working class, the democratic, creative intelligentsia, and representatives of cooperative owners, private

farmers, and leaseholders—in other words, of those strata of the population that today determine our society's progress, for all intents and purposes.

We believe this should be a party with a lively response to changes in life, a party without claims to creating a single and eternally true theory. It should be based upon the whole wealth of democratic thought, including the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin, Gramsci, and other Marxist theorists as one of the sources. Finally, it should be a truly democratic party basing its activity on the values common to all mankind and democratic principles, firmly safeguarding the rights of the majority. It has been said here that our party has already provided such opportunities. Regrettably, three weeks before our congress started, I took a package of our alternative documents for the Russian party conference to the editors in chief of PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA. None of the documents has been published. Other documents have not been published, either. I think, if this had been done, today we could have started the work of our conference better prepared. We believe, comrades, that only from below can one create a Russian party that would really enjoy prestige in our republic. In this regard we make a concrete proposal, first, not to turn our conference into a constituent one but, instead, to seriously discuss the main concepts and draft documents on setting up a Russian Communist Party and to submit these alternative concepts for discussion or, perhaps, even an all-Russian referendum of the republic's communists. Second, to address the republic's communists saying we consider it necessary to set up such a party and here elect an authoritative organizing committee from representatives of territories and various platforms that would be able to prepare, in a really serious manner, the constituent congress of a Russian Communist Party after the 28th congress. In my view, today and at the 28th CPSU Congress, our party has perhaps its last chance for regaining the people's trust. I therefore call on all delegates to the conference to treat the decisions we are going to adopt here with utmost responsibility. Thank you. [applause]

Something else, comrades. I do not support the Leningrad initiative congress but I would suggest that representatives of the organizing committee of the Leningrad congress be also given an opportunity to describe their position. [brief applause]

TASS Summarizes 19 June Russian Conference

LD1906183590 Moscow TASS in English 1707 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The conference of Russian communists that opened in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses today is discussing two issues: the current situation and establishment of a Communist Party of the Russian Federation and the draft platform of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee for the 28th party congress and rules of the CPSU.

In his address, party General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev emphasised that the establishment of a Communist Party of the Russian Federation is advisable and necessary. He warned, however, against any forms of opposition between the Russian Federation and the Union, and between the Russian Communist Party and the CPSU.

Denouncing attempts to take advantage of the precarious situation to deal a blow at perestroyka and its supporters, Gorbachev stressed the need for consolidation and national accord on a sound basis.

A number of coreports that followed showed differing views about the future Russian Communist Party by groups of delegates.

Ivan Osadchiy of the conference organising committee opposed the idea of creating "a parliamentary-type, social democratic, reformist party."

Setting out the stance of the democratic platform, one of its leaders Vladimir Lysenko described communism as a utopian goal and called for removing this notion from the new party's programme. He also objected to retaining the word "communist" in the party's name.

Andrey Kalganov of the Marxist platform gave special attention to organisational principles. He defended the right to form platforms within the party but opposed factions' activity.

The subsequent discussion was marked by sharp criticism. Never before had the party leadership been subjected to such tough assessments at party forums.

Aleksandr Melnikov, first secretary of Siberia's Kemerovo Regional Party Committee, said that the Kuzbass party conference approved by an overwhelming majority of votes a resolution expressing mistrust in the Central Committee and the Politburo.

The conference demanded the resignations of all members of these bodies.

Melnikov warned Gorbachev against "sliding towards the cult of the personality," referring to "the gradual removal of the Central Committee and the party itself from decision making in major fields."

Colonel-General Albert Makashov, troops commander of the Volga-Ural military district, declared that Army and Navy communists were outraged by the lack of action by the Central Committee, the Politburo and the government with regard to those who harass the military and trample upon the sacred notions of patriotism and military duty.

In his opinion, the argument that "no one is going to attack us" is a "formula intended for the feeble-minded."

It is necessary to acknowledge the political plurality of views and the right to propose differing platforms on individual issues, but communist ideology should be upheld and no organisationally established factions should be allowed inside the party, said Tatyana Lyapakova, a teacher from the Vologda region.

The discussion will continue tomorrow. According to preliminary estimates, the conference will work for three to four days.

Russian Communists Consider Alternative Platforms

LD1906171890 Moscow TASS in English 1555 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Lev Aksenov and Vladimir Isachenkov]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—Two political platforms, differing from that outlined by General Secretary Mikhail Gorbachev earlier in the day, were presented to the Russian Federation Communist Party conference this afternoon.

"Passing through a profound political crisis, the Soviet Communist Party is now rapidly losing the support of the people throughout the country, including in our republic," said associate professor of the Moscow Aviation Institute Vladimir Lysenko, who spoke on behalf of the Democratic Platform in the Soviet Communist Party.

Supporters of this platform share the opinion of most Russian Federation communists who press for the creation of a new political party of Russian communists in their republic.

However, according to the speaker, it is necessary to discuss discarding those basic tenets of the communist party which no longer work and pull the party backwards.

The Democratic Platform Group believes that the Republican Communist Party should not set itself a utopian objective, as the Soviet National Communist Party did in the past (meaning the building of a communist society). The speaker called for rejecting the old name of the party which compromised itself.

The Russian Federation Communist Party, he went on to say, must base itself on the entire wealth of democratic thought, including among its sources the ideas of Marx, Lenin, Gramschi and other Marxist theoreticians.

Lysenko proposed abstaining from forming a new party at the conference and discussing instead its basic concepts, which can be subsequently submitted to the all-Russia communist referendum.

Speaking on behalf of the Marxist platform, Moscow University economic researcher Andrey Kalganov stated that communists were facing an option: to turn into a party of former state employees or to go to the masses to defend and express their interests.

He stressed that the number one priority faced by communists is to offer the people a programme to pull the country out of its crisis.

Kalganov was critical of the USSR Government's concept of the transition to a market economy. He said the programme leaves the door to the market ajar while the bureaucratic superstructure remains intact.

He also said that compensation payments were insufficient to ensure social protection guarantees when switching over to a market. It is necessary to ensure the power of local councils and strengthen the independence of work collectives.

Touching on the basis of the party structure, the representative of the Marxist platform stressed that it was necessary to break away from bureaucratic centralism and expand the rights of party grass- root organisations. The minority should be granted the right to criticize and form platforms, but it is not wise to encourage factionism and allow the party to be dismembered into pieces.

Viktor Tiulkin, secretary of the party committee of a Leningrad enterprise, then spoke on behalf of the so-called initiative congress of the Russian Communist Party. He explained that the gathering, that held in two phases in Leningrad and prompted charges that its participants sought to protect conservatism [sentence as received]. But the meeting did not seek to create a party or a faction outside the Soviet National Communist Party. "We are not a special platform," he said.

Communists who participated in the Leningrad gatherings, Tiulkin said, sought for an alternative to the policy which, according to him, had given nothing to the people over the past five perestroyka years.

He said new perestroyka dogmas had replaced the old dogmas on a number of issues. Tiulkin cited the party's rejection of the class approach as an instrument for analyzing social phenomena as leading to a shift in perestroyka objectives. He questioned who stood to gain from perestroyka in general and economic reform in particular: "Is it oriented towards the interests of the majority of the common people or the interests of a narrow group of people who know how to make money?"

The mass withdrawal of workers from the Soviet Communist Party, Tiulkin said, was prompted by the fact that workers were feeling the growing injustice, "sanctified" by the present policy.

Summing up the political stance of participants in the Leningrad conference, the speaker said, "We favour the unity of Marxists, not the unity of Marxists and those who pervert Marxism".

A lively discussion followed of issues raised in the presentations.

Central Committee Leader on Party Conference

LD1906190690 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report from the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs Press Center by TASS correspondents Boris Zverev and Yuriy Rublevskiy]

[Text] Moscow, Jun 19 (TASS)—The conference of the communists of Russia, which opened in Moscow today, is taking place in an atmosphere of discussion, in dissent, in a lively way, and "with thoughts and passions at white hot heat," Yuriy Manayenkov, secretary of the Central Committee of the CPSU, said today when he spoke at a briefing on the results of the first day of the work of the forum of communists [words indistinct].

He reported that questions were put forward for discussion by those taking part in the conference that had to do with the current moment and the creation of a Communist Party of the Russian Federation, and the drafts of the platform of the Central Committee of the CPSU for the 28th Congress of the Party and the Charter of the CPSU. The conference confirmed its working bodies, its Presidium, Secretariat, its editorial and credentials commission, and its procedures, Yuriy Manayenkov added.

Yuriy Manayenkov dealt in detail on the basic tenets of the report delivered to the delegates by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee. Stressing the important role of the conference for both the destiny of Russia and for the whole country, Yuriy Manayenkov expressed his conviction that it would open up new political prospects for the communists of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]. "The further fate of the Communist Party of the USSR, and indeed of the whole of our union, depends on how accurately they are defined," he added.

On the subject of the varied reaction in the party to the issue of the status of the 200 workers and collective farmers invited to the conference on the recommendation of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee, Yuriy Manayenkov described the fact that they were invited as "both positive and useful." He expressed the conviction that this question "did not and will not give rise to any aggravation."

Agenda for Congress of People's Deputies Reported

LD2006064390 Moscow TASS in English 0637 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS parliamentary correspondent Lev Aksenov]

[Text] Moscow June 20 TASS—The First Congress of Russia's People's Deputies will today discuss the decree on power (on the mechanism of people's power in the Russian Federation).

The draft decree, suggested by a group of Leningrad deputies, was endorsed in principle at the previous meeting. But as there were many amendments, the editing commission was instructed to sum them up and submit them for the consideration of people's deputies.

There must also be elections today to vacancies on the Council of the Republic, one of the chambers of Russia's Supreme Soviet. The congress will also discuss the problem of the Russian media.

The congress is expected to end today. It has been working in the Grand Kremlin Palace for over four weeks.

Silayev Calls for 'Radical Economic Reform'

LD1906193590 Moscow TASS in English 1904 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—"I plan to use the time given to me to carry out a radical economic reform in the Russian Federation," Prime Minister Ivan Silayev, confirmed in his new position by the First Congress of People's Deputies of the USSR's biggest republic a day before, told a news conference here today.

The Russian premier called for complete economic freedom for all producers operating on Russian territory.

The future government, he said, would encourage the transfer of small enterprises in the services sector and consumer goods manufacture to private owners.

Replying to questions from journalists, Silayev said he planned to form a government within one month.

Candidates to ministerial posts will be chosen depending on their susceptibility to new ideas and commitment to a radical economic reform.

Silayev favoured a substantial reduction in the number of republican branch ministries and renewed managerial structure.

Parliament Forms Committees, Commissions

LD1906203490 Moscow TASS in English 2023 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Report by TASS correspondent Dmitriy Polunin]

[Text] Moscow June 19 TASS—The Tuesday session of the Russian Federation parliament was devoted to forming standing committees and commissions and electing their leaders.

In the morning, the two chambers at their separate meetings formed standing commissions of the Council of the Republic and the Council of Nationalities and discussed proposals to set up joint committees. They will deal with inter-republican economic relations, agrarian and ecological issues, the development of science and education and other problems.

In the afternoon, a joint session of the two chambers discussed the list of committees. Stormy debate started

when their rights and duties and candidates for their leaders came up for discussion. Speakers noted that the atmosphere became charged because deputies regarded the matter to be of great importance. Deputies worked to form a parliamentary structures of great benefit to Russia and its citizens.

Members of both chambers will be represented in the committees. In addition, the amendment to the Russian Federation Constitution, approved by deputies on Monday, opened new opportunities for people's deputies who are not members of committees.

On Wednesday, people's deputies of the Russian Federation will continue work at their congress in the Kremlin.

Western Republics

First Belorussian Supreme Soviet Session Resumes

LD1906132690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] The first session of the Belorussian Supreme Soviet resumed work today in Minsk. The election of the chairmen of the permanent and temporary commissions of the republic's supreme body of state power is continuing. Then there will be a discussion of the account by the Belorussian Council of Ministers on the work done to eliminate the consequences of the accident at the Chernobyl power station.

Stock Exchange Reopens in Minsk After 60 Years

LD1506163990 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0730 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Lipskiy]

[Text] Minsk, 15 Jun (TASS)—The stock exchange has resumed its activity in the capital of Soviet Belorussia after an interval of over 60 years. Today it announced the opening of a brokerage mission of the Chelyabinsk Rotor-Bank cooperative. Andrey Taratukhin, director of the marketing service of the Minsk commercial bank, is, so far, the only "stock-jobber".

The institution of the stock exchange in Soviet Belorussia is taking place in difficult conditions. If the absence of competent specialists can be compensated for by their intensive ten-day training in Moscow or their probation in the West German city of Frankfurt-am-Main, then the creation of a securities market in the republic and the country requires time.

"In the country, enterprises have issued stocks to the value R200 million," broker Andrey Taratukhin says. However, that is mainly in stocks of labor collectives—inscribed stock which cannot be put up for sale and does not give the right of ownership." The Belorussian stock-jobbers "born" today expect changes; they think that the transition to market relations will change the situation. Be that as it may, the agreement on the opening of a brokerage mission in Minsk has been signed and the sizes of the fees for brokers for operations carried out have been defined. The stock-exchange will work three calendar days a month. At 1800 Moscow time, the buying and selling of stocks will take place.

Moldavian Law on Dignity of Supreme Soviet Chief

LD1906164990 Kishinev SOVETSKAYA MOLDAVIYA in Russian 7 June 90 p 1

[Decree by the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet on protecting the honor and dignity of the chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet; signed by M. Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian Supreme Soviet in Kishinev on 5 June]

[Text] Recognizing the impermissibility of damaging the honor and dignity of the chairman of the Moldavian Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet, who is the supreme officer of the republic, the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet decrees:

Article 1. Publicly insulting the chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet or slandering him is punishable with a fine of up to R3,000 or corrective work for up to two years or imprisonment for up to six years.

The same acts committed through the press or other media are punishable with corrective work for up to two years or imprisonment for up to six years.

Article 2. The courts may impose a fine of up to R25,000 upon the media publishing material deliberately insulting the chairman the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet or containing slander against him.

The functioning of organs of the mass media repeatedly disseminating material deliberately insulting the chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet or containing slander against him can be curtailed by court ruling.

Article 3. This law comes into effect from the day of publication.
[Signed] M. Snegur, chairman of the Moldavian SSR Supreme Soviet
Kishinev, 5 June 1990

Moldavian Resolution on Mass Media Viewed

PM2006080190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 19 Jun 90 First p 2

[ATEM-TASS report: "Attention Focused on Press"]

[Text] Kishinev, 18 Jun—A session of the Moldavia Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet has adopted a resolution on the formation of a national television and radio broadcasting center. As a result of the discussion, a point on the "depoliticization and deideologization" of this mass media organ was added to the draft presented to deputies.

The discussion of the Moldavia SSR Supreme Soviet draft resolution on the national information center

which is to replace the present news agency ATEM took place in a tense atmosphere.

Deputy F. Angeli, director of the Moldavian news agency, protested firmly at the fact that when working on this document the standing commission on glasnost and the mass media did not even deem it necessary to invite the agency's representatives to a commission sitting or to visit the collective. He said that the subordination of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting and the news agency to the Supreme Soviet and not the Council of Ministers is a dangerous move. Legislative power and the mass media should not be in the same hands. The mass media must be demonopolized and subordinated only to the law.

The draft resolution was not adopted and a decision was made that further work be done on it.

The Supreme Soviet session accepted the commission's proposal on the creation of the Supreme Soviet press organ "SFATUL CERII" (SOVIET OF THE COUNTRY). The newspaper will be published six times a week in the state language and Russian (in translation from Moldavian). In addition, the monthly journal MONITORUL OFICIAL AL MOLDOVEI (OFFICIAL MONITOR OF MOLDOVA) will begin publication.

Ukrainian Party Congress Opens in Kiev 19 Jun

LD1906114690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1000 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] A regular congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party opened in Kiev today. It is scheduled to last approximately four or five days. However, it is possible that the forum will close only after the 28th CPSU Congress, with the election of the republic's Communist Party leading bodies.

Proceedings Viewed

LD1906165290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] The 28th Ukraine Communist Party Congress opened in Kiev today. A report from our correspondent Vladimir Sokolov:

[Sokolov] Delegates spent a large part of the first day of the work of the republican communist party congress on discussing its agenda. About 20 supplements and amendments were put forward to the preliminary agenda. The most important of them, adopted by a majority of votes, was to hold the congress in two stages: The current one, before the 28th CPSU Congress, and the second one after it, on the basis of the documents it adopts.

The status of the delegates of the current session was also adopted, according to which they keep their mandates and authority until the next Ukraine Communist Party Congress. It was also decided to elect the first secretary of the Central Committee of the Republican Communist Party and also the editors of the republican party papers at the current session. Proposals were adopted on party symbols in the shape of a badge of a member of the Ukraine Communist Party.

All this took up so much time that the congress has only heard the basic report of Ivashko, first secretary of the Communist Party Central Committee, on the political situation and the main areas of the activity of the Communist Party of the Ukraine at the current stage, and discussion of it has started.

The delegates to the congress sent a greetings telegram to the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic party conference, and through it to all the communists of Russia, wishing them successful work and the consolidation of all the healthy forces in society.

Ivashko Delivers Activities Report

LD1906212190 Moscow TASS in English 2046 GMT 19 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Aleksey Petrunya]

[Text] Kiev June 20 TASS—The 28th Congress of the Ukrainian Communist Party opened in Kiev on Tuesday. First Secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Vladimir Ivashko delivered a report on the activities of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central committee.

"Our congress," he said "is to give a comprehensive analysis of the sociopolitical situation in the Ukraine, the positive and negative trends, to assess what has been done and work out a well- considered political line for the future. The Ukrainian Communist Party should come to the 28th Congress of the CPSU with a clear-cut joint position on all major issues," he said.

The speaker focused on questions of establishing the Ukraine's state sovereignty. He emphasised that sovereignty was totally indispensible for the Ukraine's political, economic, social and spiritual development, for the preservation and further flourishing of its culture and language, respect for the national identity of the Ukrainian people and all ethnic groups living in the republic.

Ivashko stressed the to [as received] draft and conclude a new Union treaty. It must formulate the powers and spheres of state management which the Ukraine voluntary [as received] passes over to the centre. The Ukraine's sovereignty will also get it more actively involved in international life.

The congress, which will be held in two stages, will sum up the results of the discussion of the draft platform of the CPSU to the 28th congress and new party rules. In accordance with a new status of the communist parties of Union republics, the congress will consider the policy-making principles of the Ukrainian Communist Party in conditions of the republic's transition to state sovereignty. The delegates will also discuss the Ukrainian Communist Party rules and form its leading bodies.

Deputies View Sovereignty

LD1906123390 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Excerpts] A poll conducted among participants of the current session of the Ukraine Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Supreme Soviet has produced interesting results. The majority of the deputies are alarmed by the political situation in the republic. Almost 99 percent of them regard it as tense, including 22 percent who think that it is extremely tense. The existing state of affairs is explained by them by such factors as the passivity of the authorities, resistance to restructuring on the part of conservative forces, destabilization of the economy, and the actions of newly-created formations. Only one quarter of those polled predict changes for the better during this year. The majority of deputies expressed pessimism. They forecast that the tension within the republic will increase. [passage omitted]

Sovereignty of the republic is regarded by many deputies as the main point. A draft declaration on the state sovereignty of Ukraine has already been prepared. It is now being polished up in the standing commissions. [passage omitted]

This document will determine not only the supremacy of republican laws in all walks of life, politics, economics, and culture. Many deputies believe that citizenship of our republic should be introduced. [passage omitted]

But let us return once again to the sociological poll we began with. Exactly half the deputies polled believe that the Ukraine should become a sovereign republic within the renovated USSR; 38 percent are inclined to see Ukraine as an independent state within a new confederation; and 10 percent advocate complete separation from the USSR.

All this means that the adoption of the declaration on state sovereignty of our republic will be preceded by sharp polemics in the Supreme Soviet, and not only during plenary sessions, but also at sittings of standing commissions.

Kharkov Oblast, City Party Leaderships Combined

PM2006102190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 Second Edition p 3

[PRAVDA correspondent I. Lakhno report: "Plenum Decides"]

[Text] Kharkov, 15 Jun—A combined Kharkov party obkom and gorkom [oblast and city party committees] plenum has been held. In connection with a recent oblast party conference decision the plenum examined the question of combining the posts of obkom and gorkom first secretary. By a show of hands A.K. Myalits, first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party obkom, was elected first secretary of Kharkov party gorkom also.

Ukrainian Communist Faction Group Formed

LD1806162990 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Excerpts] Nearly 40 deputy groups are operating in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet. Another one was formed today: it calls itself the Democratic Platform of the Communist Party of Ukraine. In connection with this, Deputy Volodymyr Filenko, member of the group, said in an interview:

[Begin Filenko recording] The Democratic Platform of the Communist Party of Ukraine was formed from deputies who in the past were active in local party discussion clubs. We issued a statement saying that a number of communists do not subscribe to the position held by the official majority. Therefore we decided to unite: so far our group has 43 members. We will operate as a parliamentary faction. [passage omitted] We renounce democratic centralism and adhere to the principle of polycentrism. We have joined the official opposition, called People's Council. [end recording]

Young Ukrainian Insulters of Lenin Pardoned

LD1806164190 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 15 Jun 90

[Text] Deputy Oleksandr Kotsyuba, chairman of the newly formed Commission of Legislation and Legality of the Ukrainian Socialist Soviet Republic supreme soviet, made today a statement on a matter that had been entrusted to him—namely the fate of two young people, Mykola Berdnyk and Andriy Dukhovnykov. Let us repeat once again: On 22 April this year, during a mass meeting in Kiev, they boastingly denigrated the memory of the founder of the Soviet state, Vladimir Lenin, by laying at the foot of his monument a wreath of barbed wire. The law and order authorities evaluated this act as hooliganism stemming from political considerations. The culprits were arrested.

Their parents turned to certain people's deputies with a request that the matter be raised at one of the sessions of the Supreme Soviet. The matter was entrusted to Oleksandr Kotsyuba, and his statement related what has been done.

He noted, in part, that Mykola Berdnyk and Andriy Dukhovnykov admitted their guilt. Taking into account their sincere repentance, their youth, and the promise not to resort to violations of the law in the future, the republic's procurator ordered their release from detention and terminated criminal proceedings against them.

Odessa Proclaimed Free Enterprise Territory

LD1506122290 Moscow TASS in English 1048 GMT 15 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Veprik]

[Text] Odessa, the Ukraine, June 15 TASS—The Ukrainian city of Odessa and adjacent areas will soon be proclaimed a territory of free enterprise.

The municipal council of this Black Sea coastal city has approved a coordination council and the directorate of an Odessa free town enterprise, which will implement the project prepared by Ukrainian scientists.

Greater Odessa includes three major ports and several towns, suitable for developing joint enterprise, Odessa free town director Vladimir Dergachev said.

"We need billions of dollars," he said. "The state is not able to credit them to us, so we seek capital from foreign banks and Soviet emigrants," he said.

"We would also welcome financial aid from residents in the region and the country. In return, we will provide our creditors with the most favourable conditions for trade and joint venture projects in various economic sectors.

"They would also receive other benefits, such as a smaller income tax, as compared with joint ventures located outside the free zone."

Dergachev said priority in placing capital would be given to businessmen that could offer joint venture projects based on mixed capital and advanced, ecologically-pure technology.

Odessa free town plans to develop, above all, the construction and services industries, produce consumer goods and build processing facilities.

"On the basis of the international division of labour, we will satiate the Soviet region market with consumer goods and foodstuffs, and in the future we hope to win foreign customers," Dergachev said.

Pestryalovo Radar Construction Arouses Protest

LD0506145390 Kiev International Service in Ukrainian 1800 GMT 4 Jun 90

[Text] Meetings of many thousands and picketing against the Pestryalovo radar station near Mukachevo in Transcarpathian Oblast have not subsided. They became especially acute when military builders ignored the decision of the oblast soviet that the construction had to stop. The telegram sent by local residents to President Gorbachev remained unanswered. This raised a wave of dissatisfaction and protests among the population. A one-day strike was held at many enterprises of Mukachevo, highways around the town were blocked, unsanctioned meetings took place at enterprises and opposite the city and raykon party committees.

At present, all basic construction operations at the radar station site have stopped because local residents have interrupted the delivery of building materials.

Rally Protests Construction of Khmelnitskiy AES

LD0506183390 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 5 Jun 90

[Text] An ecology rally has taken place in the Ukrainian town of Slavuta which is in Khmelnitskiy Oblast. The rally's participants demanded the closure of the Khmelnitskiy nuclear power station [AES]. It should be said that this issue is not being raised for the first time. Picketing of the station is underway. Fifteen people are continuing a protest hunger strike. A coordinating strike committee has been set up. The Dolgunovskiy cement factory has refused to supply its output for the construction of the AES. Yuriy Gonuchak, a member of the Khmelnitskiy Rukh organization—it should be said that the movement as a whole is one of the initiator's of today's rally—said that if the session of the oblast Soviet of People's Deputies does not take a decision on a moratorium on the construction of the station then a strike will begin. An interfax corespondent has cited the following figure: more than 80 percent of the oblast's inhabitants are coming out in favor of this decision. Only I have a question: what do these 80 percent of inhabitants of the oblast propose should happen about the oblast's power supply? In the long term, naturally.

Increasing Ferment in Western Ukraine Viewed

AU0606100690 Warsaw GAZETA WYBORCZA in Polish 28 May 90 p 6

[Andrzej Lomanowski report: "Liberated Region"]

[Text] The long lines wait patiently in the afternoon heat. The people are waiting for the first deliveries to the Lvov food stores. They have been waiting like this since dawn. They each hold their doctor's prescription, because in Lvov only children are entitled to milk, and a doctor has to confirm this right to milk by writing out a prescription.

This is the price that Lvov and the whole of Western Ukraine has to pay for the results of the March elections to the Councils of Peoples' Deputies which were swept by the opposition. Vyacheslav Chornovil (15 years in prison for "anti-Soviet propaganda"), was elected chairman of the executive committee of the Lvov regional council and the whole region found itself in the middle of an economic blockade.

The curtain dividing Lvov off from the rest of the country fell silently. One day the butter ran out and over the next few days, all milk and milk products disappeared from the stores.

There were no thundering statements and nobody turned off the supplies in an ostentatious way. At the center (it is not known whether in Kiev, or in Moscow) orders were quietly issued. The functionaries responsible for the flow of supplies made several adjustments to their columns of delivery figures and the trucks moved off in all directions, but carefully avoided Lvov.

There was also an attempt to limit meat supplies, but to the amazement of the "comrades working in the economic departments," it soon became apparent that Western Ukraine does not need these supplies as it is self sufficient in meat production.

In the city's center, on the building of the Council of the Peoples' Deputies, there flies the yellow and blue Ukrainian national flag which was officially banned until recently. Up to six months ago one could still get fined 300 rubles (average earnings are 150-180 rubles per month) for wearing this nationalist symbol. The communist party building next to it flies the red and blue flag of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. It had to move over, say the people of Lvov, and more recently a yellow and blue flag has been hoisted beside it.

The communist party in Lvov has not come to terms with the opposition victory and from the very first it has thrown its support behind the central authority in the war of attrition between the central authorities and the new local authorities.

First, there was the refusal to allow the radio transmission of the new council's first meeting, because, it was said, the cost of such a transmission is too prohibitive. Chornovil appealed to the Lvov citizens and they contributed three million rubles to finance the transmission which only cost half a million.

In April there was another clash. This concerned the paper called "FREE UKRAINE" [title published in Polish], which until that time was the government's mouthpiece. It was now said that it was not a government paper after all. "If the council wishes to have the paper, then it must pay for it," was the magnanimous offer made by Pogrebnyak, chairman of the Lvov communist party committee. "Why should we lease our own property?" was the reply of the deputies.

They decided to found their own paper, to be called "FOR A FREE UKRAINE" [title published in Polish], and the communist party committee panicked. Everyone is convinced that if Chornovil establishes a new paper then all the other papers in Western Ukraine will immediately lose all readership. Negotiations began, and are still continuing.

The political campaign has seen the attempt to involve the Poles who live in Lvov. Unknown persons have painted slogans like: "We Shall Reconquer Lvov," and "Lvov Belongs to Us" on buildings and walls. In the city, the populace thinks this is the work of visiting Poles, but in the opinion of the 12,000-strong Polish community (Lvov has a population of 700,000), there are a suspiciously large number of these slogans and they appear with strange regularity.

These clashes and the obstacles that are being thrown in the way of the new elected authorities are beginning to anger the people of Lvov.

Most of the meetings in the city begin with the words: "That communist party bandit Pogrebnyak has again...."

The party authorities in Kiev are terrified and are even considering granting autonomy to Western Ukraine in order to cordon it off from the rest of the Ukraine.

The people who live in Central and Eastern Ukraine feel they are political emigres when they come to Lvov, states a local activist of the Republican party (formerly the Ukrainian Helsinki Association). In the main street one can buy all the clandestine papers from all over the Ukraine. From time to time we go to Kiev and sell our stuff there right in the middle of the October Revolution Square, states one of the paper distributors. The militia in Kiev disperses the local sellers, but they are scared of touching people from Lvov, he adds.

Meanwhile, the lines for milk are getting longer. One of the activists in Lvov has said that if nothing changes then they too will begin a blockade of the Soviet Union, and in the Western Ukraine we have deposits of the purest oil in the whole of the USSR.

NVKD Kharkov Massacres Examined

PM0606164090 London MOSCOW NEWS in English No 1, 1-7 Jun 90 p 10

[Gennadiy Zhavoronkov article: "Horror of the Black Road"]

[Text] In the 1930s the Institute of Nuclear Physics where Landau and Kapitsa tried to split the atom was situated just outside the city of Kharkov. Nearby stood five huts, on a plot called Pyatikhatki.

The area, which is now within the city, was connected by a brick road which led to Belgorod. The locals called it the Black Road.

The forest land, officially designated as "square six," was enclosed by a barbed wire fence. Covered trucks lined with zinc sheets would rumble in through the gate, then speed back to Kharkov as soon as they had unloaded their cargo.

At night the guard-dogs would howl, as if trying to alert the world to the horror inside. Were the locals aware of what was going on? Maybe they were—why else would they talk of a "Black Road?"

Even Yezhov, then head of the people's Commissariat of Internal Affairs (NVKD, now KGB), regarded the NVKD department in Kharkov as one of the cruelest in the land.

The local NVKD head Roitman would shoot two or even three times as many prisoners as his superiors ordered. Loaded trucks would leave the Kharkov NVKD headquarters heading off in different directions, each driver knowing only his own destination. Only Roitman and the NVKD commandant Zelyony knew where every truck was heading.

The war came and went, Kharkov was taken and retaken twice. The land was lacerated by artillery shells and the tanks of both armies. It seemed that all traces of death camps had been obliterated forever by the passage of time; that we we would never learn where Roitman and Zelyony had hidden the bodies of their victims.

Early this year, some letters which had passed between Commandant Zelyony and the director of the local Jewish cemetery, Gorbachev came to light.

They had been saved during the evacuation of Kharkov, and had lain untouched in the KGB archives ever since. A letter headed "Kharkov, 11 March 1938," reads:

"I, the undersigned head of the cemetery, Gorbachev, have on instructions of the Commandant of the NVKD department Zelyony, received and buried 39 human bodies in the presence of the NVKD representatives from the Kharkov region.

The letter is signed by Gorbachev himself, and two witnesses whose signatures are illegible.

While the witnesses of the burials changed constantly, the director of the cemetery remained the same. He meticulously recorded crimes of which the world was unaware. A total of 6,865 bodies were buried in the cemetery between 9 August 1937 and 11 March 1938. Here is the monthly record of those buried in 1937:
—August—348 bodies
—September—747 bodies
—October—1,102 bodies
—December—1,203 bodies
—Grand total—4,363 bodies

Almost every day a new mound appeared in the Jewish cemetery, meaning that yet more people had perished. The cemetery director knew only too well that the murder machine could only accelerate. For that reason, he was careful not to use up too much space, burying between 30 and 100 bodies of people shot in the NVKD basements in a single grave. Nevertheless, the cemetery ran out of space by 1939.

The whole story remained hushed up until, in the 1960s, some young Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] members decided to level the cemetery grounds and replace it with a park. They started work enthusiastically, accompanied by songs and a brass band. In no time they had razed the cemetery, but laying out the park proved to be a problem.

In April members of the Kharkov branch of Memorial, the organisation set up to commemorate the victims of Stalin's purges and the local KGB department discovered that bodies were buried under the city dump. They had the rubbish removed, and erected a temporary gravestone.

The discovery of the death roads administered by Zelyony and Roitman is a different story. A second road was discovered before the war, but was somehow forgotten—or maybe someone ordered that it be forgotten.

In 1940, little boys playing around the Black Road found some unfamiliar coins, some buckles with eagles on them, and some strange decorations and military insignia.

People could guess why these things were there, but even guessing was banned at that time.

In the 1970s the director of forestry, Anatoliy Omelich, wrote to the KGB saying that he was worried because human bones and sculls could be seen poking through the ground after showers, and even more often during spring and autumn in "square six." There was also a foul smell, he wrote.

The reaction was very swift. Machines were sent to drill holes in the ground, which were then filled with acid. The place was fenced off, and a holiday home and dachas for KGB staff were built.

Historians have recently discovered documents relating to the NKVD shootings of Polish officers, which name Kharkov as one of the locations. The Deputy head of the Kharkov KGB department, Aleksandr Nessen, may shrug his shoulders. There are no documents, no witnesses, only rumours. But there is already hard evidence that "square six" is the site of a mass grave.

In April of this year the KGB handed their dachas back to the city authorities, and they have now been allocated to homeless families. Today's KGB men do not want to be implicated in the deeds of Yezhov and Beriya.

The procurator's office has started to investigate the mass burials, but the investigation is being conducted slowly and reticently, with an apparant reluctance to use the testimonials of surviving witnesses. Here is one such account by Ivan Dvorchenko, who returned to Kharkov after he was demobbed:

"I went to work as a driver for the Kharkov military district. Our garage was at 41 Pushkin Street. The NKVD garage was across the road. I often chatted with their drivers, especially one by the name of Olekskiy. He was only 30, but his hair was completely grey.

"He told me that just before the war he was transporting dead bodies to the woods near Pyatikhatki. The people had been shot inside the NKVD building in Chernynshevsky Street, where he picked up the bodies in his covered 1.5 tonne truck. The bodies were dumped in the back covered with a tarpaulin. Many of them were soldiers from the Polish Army.

"As for me, I drove the bosses around in a GAZ M-1 car. Sometimes I took them to the regional party committee dachas on the left side of the Belgorod motorway. My mate Vasil once showed me the place where they buried the executed—it was a little way away from the regional party committee dachas, on the right side of the motorway. In that part of the woods there was a tractor on constant duty to tow the trucks into the forest if the weather was too wet."

Dvorchenko is not the only witness of the crime committed against the Polish officers in 1940. There is also the son of a driver who drove his truck between Kharkov and the Black Road. Although he was sworn to secrecy, the driver told his family many times about the macabre business on the Black Road. He used to weep a lot and could not get rid of the appalling stench which haunted him day and night. He also told them of the fate of the Polish officers.

Event today, little boys search around the Black Road for Polish coins and military decorations, unaware that the history of the area is supposed to be a secret.

The first little boy from Pyatikhatki whom I asked about the Black Road answered without batting an eyelid: "You're looking for the Poles? Let's go the the 'place,' and I'll put you in contact with people who swop their finds."

Unfortunately, no one was at the 'place' when we went there, but the boys willingly showed me their digging technique. Behind the KGB dachas there is a steep slope. There, all sorts of Polish ensignia can be found. You don't even need to dig in the spring, everything rises to the surface.

Zelyony chose a terrible place for the burials. The forest plain where the KGB dachas stand is bordered by an area of lowland to which the spring floods carry human bodies. The land of Pyatikhatki rejects them, as if unwilling to be a partner in crime. There are mounds in the forest, as if the earth is going through wild convulsions every spring and autumn. The dead, it seems, are crying out for help. But we don't hear them, or pretend not to hear them.

Caucasus

Armenian Party Elects CPSU Congress Delegates

NC2006105490 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 20 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] According to an ARMENPRES report, the republican electoral commission supervising the election of delegates from the Armenian Communist Party to the 28th CPSU Congress met and discussed the results of the elections. It was noted that for the first time the election of delegates was organized on the basis of party electoral okrugs and was held in a democratic atmosphere with multiple candidates and vigorous and involved participation by communists.

A total of 48 communists were elected delegates to the 28th congress in accordance with the norms of representation in the 12 multi-delegate and 19 single-delegate okrugs into which all party city and rayon organizations were divided. The elected delegates are workers, farmers, representatives of the scientific and technological intelligentsia, and builders from the earthquake zone. A number of party workers are also included among the delegates.

The meeting was chaired by (?Aghayan), deputy chairman of the commission.

Armenian Army Officer Denounces Armed Groups

NC0506112990 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] Vardan Vardanyan, an officer of the Armenian National Army and chairman of the Military Council, recently expressed the desire to meet the reporters of the paper, in order to issue a declaration about the 27 May incidents.

Mr. Vardanyan told reporter Ruben Grigoryan: The Armenian National Army does not belong to or owe allegiance to any political party. We have declared in our program that the Armenian National Army owes allegiance only to the multiparty national parliament. Our task is to protect the people against internal and external enemies. We are deeply convinced that no political party should have armed bodies to resolve its ideological and political differences.

Referring to the bloody 27 May incidents, Mr. Vardanyan said: A Military Council made up of the different armed bodies was set up on 10 May 1990. The council has worked out a number of basic principles. One of the most important is that no armed unit or formation has the right to resort to independent action without instructions from the Military Council.

Mr. Vardanyan concluded by saying that the bloody incidents of 27 May were a premeditated and planned provocation (?aimed at creating an odious parallel to the January events in Baku).

Army Paper Reviews Armenian Anti-Army Events

PM2006113390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 First Edition p 5

[Dispatch by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel V. Kaushanskiy under "Direct Line" rubric: "Guerrillas Are Being Whitewashed"]

[Text] Yerevan—It would appear that the tension which reigned only recently on the streets of Yerevan and certain other Armenian cities is ebbing, to put it figuratively. In the last two days the alarming tone of situation reports has somewhat decreased. The citizens of Yerevan, and they are not alone, evidently link the almost imperceptible "detente," not without cause, to the two-day talks which were held the other day by the republic's minister of internal affairs with representatives of the so-called self-defense brigades.

On the other hand, the anti-Army fever in the mass media is not abating. On the contrary, it shows rather a marked upsurge. Leaflets distributed in Yerevan in recent days have featured a statement by the leaders of the Armenian National Army which unambiguously explains that the emergence of armed groups in the republic "has been promoted by the presence in Armenia of occupying troops."

But this, so to speak, is the informal press. And the opinion of the official organs? An appeal by Armenia's artistic unions to the Russian public, which was published by the republic newspaper KOMMUNIST, contains overt slander against the internal troops and subunits of the Soviet Army. They are literally accused of genocide against the Armenian people. At the same time the actions of the extremists are unabashedly presented as a "national liberation struggle." By whom and with what methods this "struggle" is conducted was clearly seen by millions of viewers of a special news broadcast by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, carried by Central Television on the evening of 7 June. Therefore we will not enter into a polemic and comment on what is widely known.

True, the leadership of the republic continue as before to call on the guerrillas to hand in their arms. This is what is happening in words. And in deeds? Before sending these lines to the press office, I again called the Transcaucasus Military District operational group headquarters, asking the by now traditional question: How does the situation stand in terms of surrendering arms? Lieutenant Colonel T. Gritsulyak, senior officer in the operational group, replied as follows: "I have no good news whatsoever. Not a single gun has been handed in. As for confiscation—yes, there was one. On the night of 8-9 June, in the region of the Sofulu settlement, three Armenian guerrillas were detained by the military duty guard post. And they were obliged to part with two hunting rifles and one carbine."

Artashatskiy Rayon Elects New First Secretary

NC0306113090 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0500 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the review of KHORHRDAYIN HAYASTAN]

[Text] The newspaper reports that the Armenian Communist Party's Artashatskiy Rayon committee plenum met and discussed an organizational issue. The plenum relieved Gevorkyan from his duties as first secretary of the party's rayon committee at his request.

After a secret vote, the plenum elected Mkhitaryan as first secretary of the Armenian Communist Party's Artshatskiy Rayon committee. He had worked as deputy chairman of the Armenian Communist Party's general administration [word indistinct] and chairman of the Artashatskiy Rayon soviet people's deputies' executive committee.

The plenum was attended by Oleg Lobov, second secretary of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee, who also spoke to the plenum. The plenum was also attended by Mkrtichyan, member of the Armenian Communist Party Central Committee Bureau and head of the party and cadre administration.

Armenian, Azerbaijani 16 June Meeting Reported

NC2006102590 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1800 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Armenian Internal Affairs Minister Levon Galstyan and Azerbaijani Internal Affairs Minister Asadov met at the Armenian-Azerbaijani border on 16 June. They exchanged information on the situation prevailing in the republic and examined the entire range of problems with the view to stabilizing the situation. The problems of establishing law and order in border regions and along the railways and roads were also discussed. It was pointed out that the peoples of both republics are actively assisting the internal affairs organs in the establishment of law and order and have resolutely expressed their opposition to the illegal activities of the various informal organizations which are destabilizing the situation.

The internal affairs ministers of the two republics, while showing understanding of the complexity of the social and political processes, paid special attention to the problems faced by all workers of the internal affairs organs in ensuring strict observance of Soviet laws and preventing illegal acts. It was underlined that success depends in particular on strengthening cooperation between internal affairs organs in the border regions.

More on Meeting

NC2006074690 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 0440 GMT 19 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The internal affairs ministers of Azerbaijan and Armenia met on 16 June to discuss the efforts to strengthen law and order and eliminate tension in border rayons.

In view of the complex social and political developments in the two republics, the two ministers discussed the situation prevailing in the region, which has been destabilized by the aggressive acts of the armed groups in Armenia, and focused significant attention on the need for abiding by the laws and for resolute measures by the internal organs to obstruct lawless activities in the border rayons, starting with the disarming of the Armenian armed groups.

Representatives of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry troops, the ministry of internal affairs of the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic, and several city and internal affairs organs from Azerbaijan and Armenia participated in the meeting.

Situation in NKAO Seen 'Extremely Tense'

NC0406142090 Yerevan International Service in Armenian 1530 GMT 3 Jun 90

[From the republican press review]

[Text] The situation in Artsakh [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, NKAO] is extremely tense and it has not been possible to stabilize it. As the statements issued by the state of emergency military commandant, and regularly published in the oblast paper, confirm, no day goes by without an illegal act taking place. The stoning of cars by persons of both nationalities has become a common occurrence. Tanks are patrolling the city. The streets and entrances to the city are closed by armored cars. Soldiers inspect identity documents and detain those who are not locally registered. Cars belonging to Armenians have been stoned in Khodzhaly and Agdam. A reciprocal stoning of cars occurred in Askeran and Mardakert. Journalists have been prohibited from entering Stepanakert. The situation is volatile.

Another report from Stepanakert says that the Armenians of Artsakh, in sympathy with the Armenian nation, observed a day of mourning on 29 May by flying Armenian state flags and the tricolor bordered with black on residential and administrative buildings. The soldiers seized the flags, put them into the armored cars, and took them away. When the people demanded that the flags be returned, the soldiers replied: Go and ask for them from the Organizational Committee; we are simply carrying out their orders.

The Armenians of Artsakh observed the day of mourning with clenched teeth. The organization of any celebrations for children in Stepanakert on 1 June, the international day for the protection of children, was prohibited.

Azerbaijan Ministers Debate NKAO's Development

NC0506124890 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The republic's Council of Ministers has held a meeting to examine the application of the special administration system in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] and the reconfirmation of the decision adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers for the management of NKAO's economy during the term of office of the special administration committee in the NKAO. Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers, informed the meeting that the decision adopted by the USSR Council of Ministers resolutely and irrevocably reinstated the republic's sovereign rights over the NKAO. Furthermore, Gasanov detailed the measures put into effect by the republic's leaders, ministries, and main administrations to strengthen NKAO's economy and maintain the oblast's social and economic development.

Gasanov concluded by briefly assessing the republic's social development program for NKAO's towns and explained the work carried out under the program. A wide-ranging exchange of views was held on the matters discussed. Proposals were put forward on the organization and realization of the republic's program.

Decisions on the matters discussed during the meeting will be published in the press.

Nakhichevan's Social, Economic Development Viewed

NC0406080990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] A regular meeting was held by the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Council of Ministers on 1 June. Gasan Gasanov, chairman of the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers, chaired the meeting. They examined the way the decision adopted by the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and the Azerbaijan SSR Council of Ministers in October 1988 for the social and economic development of the Nakhichevan Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic [ASSR] is being realized, the proposals to be made to the USSR Government to increase the pace of development in the Nakhichevan ASSR, the construction of highways in the Nakhichevan ASSR's rayons which border Armenia, and the social and economic development of the border towns.

Concrete tasks were assigned to the pertinent ministries and main administration.

Gasan Gasanov summed up the meeting.

Azerbaijan President Mutalibov on Market Economy

LD2805164690 Moscow TASS in English 1415 GMT 28 May 90

[Text] Baku May 28 (AZERINFORM-TASS)—"The transition to a market economy opens up prospects for Azerbaijan's economic development and this chance should not be missed," Ayaz Mutalibov, president of the Azerbaijan Soviet Republic, told the AZERINFORM news agency. His statement was published in the Azerbaijan press today.

"I believe we need a national programme, creating favourable conditions for the operation of foreign firms," he said. According to Mutalibov, agreement has been reached with Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov on a licence to see 500,000 tonnes of scrap iron to foreign firms, which will bring Azerbaijan a profit of some 50 million U.S. dollars. In his opinion this is enough to resolve the problem of Azeri refugees from Armenia. The money could be used, specifically, to buy prefabricated houses for them.

Turning to the working of Apsheron oil fields, Mutalibov noted that the USSR Government authorised Soviet experts, going to the summit meeting in the United States, to hold talks on the possibility of attracting U.S. firms to the exploitation of Apsheron oil deposits with the help of the latest secondary and tertiary methods.

This promises additional currency profits, which will be used to solve social problems in Baku, to recultivate Apsheron lands and improve Baku's polluted environment.

Mutalibov believes it is pertinent to transfer unused production premises to joint enterprises. Turkish businessmen, who recently visited the republic, are interested in opening a Renault car assembly factory on the construction site of an automobile plant that is being built at Gyandzha. Foreign investments could be used to develop small-scale enterprises on Azerbaijan territory, where some 300,000 able-bodied people are out of work.

"Many socio-economic problems have accumulated in Azerbiajan's economy and we believe they can be solved through integration into the Soviet Union's economy and direct international economic contacts. This is dictated also by our transition to market economy," Mutalibov stressed.

Azerbaijan's Mutalibov Meets Stepanakert Officials

NC0406150290 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 1 Jun 90

[Text] President Ayaz Mutalibov held talks with the members of the Nagorno-Karabakh Organization Committee and the representatives of the military commandant's office of the state of emergency rayon and the local law enforcement organs in Stepanakert today. Viktor Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee, and [name indistinct], deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic Council of Ministers, briefed the meeting on the work carried out to normalize the situation and resolve social and economic problems in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO].

Major General Safonov, state of emergency commandant in the NKAO region, expressed deep gratitude to the government of Azerbaijan for the importance attached to the work of the command headquarters and noted that the units of the internal troops in the NKAO will do everything possible to strengthen the situation and restore law and order. [Name indistinct], employee of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, drew attention to the fact that the employees of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs are putting measures into effect to facilitate the investigation of crimes at ethnic level and bring the criminals to account. So far 44 criminal cases have been brought to light. The criminals who were involved in them have been punished in the way they deserved.

Seferov, first secretary of [name indistinct] rayon party committee; [name indistinct], deputy chairman of the Baku City Soviet Executive Committee; [name and title indistinct]; (?Bogadokhus), chief of the Political Department of the command headquarters of the state of emergency rayon; and others addressed the convocation. President Mutalibov summed up the meeting.

Azerbaijan Party, People's Front Form Council

90US1038A Baku BAKINSKIY RABOCHIY in Russian 19 May 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "A Consultative Council Is Formed"]

[Text] A meeting of the republic leadership, representatives of the intelligentsia, and the leadership of the Azerbaijan People's Front has taken place in the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet Presidium. Discussed at the meeting were questions relating to the emergency situation in the republic, the situation in the border zone with Armenia and insuring the safety of the population, certain articles in the law on military service for citizens in the Azerbaijan SSR outside the republic and the army draft, the need to maintain sociopolitical order not only by administrative methods but also by general consensus, and the mutual relations between government organs and the Azerbaijan People's Front and others.

During the course of an exchange of opinions it was decided to set up a Consultative Council made up of representatives of the republic intelligentsia, the Azerbaijan People's Front, and other public organizations. It was determined that its main task will be to unite all the efforts of the people for a common goal, restore the sovereign rights of Azerbaijan, and draw up specific recommendations to rebuff outside encroachments.

The first meeting of the Consultative Council took place on 17 May.

1. After an exchange of opinions on establishing the post of president in the republic, the council members reached the unanimous conclusion that it stems from the draft legislation that in principle this enactment will promote radical changes in the structure of government power in the republic. Accordingly, corresponding constitutional changes should be adopted after extensive national debate, and after their approval the president should be elected not by the Supreme Soviet but by the people through a general, direct, secret vote on a contested basis.

But the council believes that giving due consideration to the tense sociopolitical situation in the republic the elections for president should not be postponed. In order to insure the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Azerbaijan SSR and implement the political and economic transformations and bring proper order to interethnic relations and safeguard the rights, freedoms, and safety of citizens, a president should be elected, as an exception, at a session of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet.

2. Measures to guarantee the security of Azerbaijan's borders with Armenia were in the main approved. At the same time, the republic's leading organs were entrusted with the task of intensifying their activity in this direction, and of achieving the implementation of certain specific measures as soon as possible.

3. It was recommended that a special commission be set up at a session of the Azerbaijan SSR Supreme Soviet for the purpose of conducting a detailed analysis of the condition of citizens doing their military service outside the republic's borders.

4. It was pointed out that the Armenian SSR's gross violation of the sovereign rights of Azerbaijan in recent years, particularly since December 1989, and the indeterminate position of the center in this matter have led to a sharp destabilization of the situation in Azerbaijan. Moreover, in this situation both the republic leadership and the informal organizations, including the Azerbaijan People's Front, have permitted certain errors. None of the sides is denying its mistakes, and accepts responsibility for its actions. At the same time, increased confrontation is unacceptable, and under present conditions totally intolerable.

It was noted that measures that have not been agreed, a tone of ultimatum in negotiations, persecution, and the ill-considered suspension of activity by some regional detachments of the Azerbaijan People's Front do not serve any rapid normalization of the situation. It was proposed that the administrative organs provide the public promptly with detailed information about the resumed activity of the newspaper AZADLYG, and about the justification for and legality of the case being brought against the people being detained.

Agreement was reached at the meeting of the Consultative Council on adopting joint measures to celebrate the 28 May anniversary of the proclamation of Azerbaijan as the first democratic republic in the East.

The council members adopted a resolution on the preparation of provisions and regulations for the Consultative Council, which will help to further the rational organization of its work.

Azerbaijan Auditing Commission Report Approved

NC0506125490 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1730 GMT 2 Jun 90

[Text] The Azerbaijan Communist Party Auditing Commission convened on 2 June. The meeting examined the question of the accounting report that the auditing commission will submit to the 32d Azerbaijan Communist Party Congress. Kaziyev, chairman of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Auditing Commission, read the draft accounting report.

The auditing commission approved the report.

Georgian Supreme Soviet To Discuss Independence

LD2006082290 Moscow TASS in English 0800 GMT 20 Jun 90

[By TASS correspondents Devi Berdzenishviliy and Boris Gazzayev]

[Text] Tbilisi June 20 TASS—The extraordinary 15th session of Georgia's Supreme Soviet opened here today. It was convened a month earlier than scheduled on the demand of fasting Tbilisi University students. Their demand was supported by a number of Georgian public organisations and political parties.

The session is to discuss making amendments to the March 9, 1990 decree of the Georgian Supreme Soviet "On guarantees of the Protection of Georgia's State Sovereignty." The decree notes that Georgia's incorporation into the Soviet Union was invalid. The session will also determine measures for the decree's implementation. The deputies will discuss the creation of a legal mechanism to restore Georgian state independence.

It is planned to discuss a package of bills on Georgian citizenship, on general democratic elections to Georgia's Supreme Soviet, on citizens' associations, the foundations of economic independence and other matters causing public concern.

Giviy Gumbaridze, president of the presidium of Georgia's Supreme Soviet and first secretary of the Georgian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report.

Central Asia

Workers Address Letter of 'Concern' to Gorbachev

LD1906222890 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] Moscow, 19 Jun (TASS)—A group of communist workers at the Motorostroitel production association in the town of Perm (Urals) have addressed an open letter to Mikhail Gorbachev, expressing concern over the reduction in the representation of workers and peasants in party- and state-elected bodies.

The letter notes that, in the conditions of a crisis situation within the country and the party, the voice of those on whose shoulders the main burden of perestroyka and the associated economic problems has fallen is being heard less and less—the voice of the workers and the collective-farm peasantry.

In the CPSU Central Committee of the latest composition, workers and peasants comprise just 11 percent, and, in the CPSU as a whole, workers account for 29.1 percent and collective farmers 7.7 percent. The results of the elections of delegates to the 28th party congress have shown that there are virtually no workers among them. In the opinion of the authors of the letter, the reason lies in the different starting possibilities of workers and peasants in comparison with leaders, the creative and scientific intelligentsia, and the secretaries of party committees.

"Having proclaimed ourselves in program documents to be 'the party of the workers and all working people'," the letter notes, "we ought, at this crucial stage, to be

recruiting as broadly as possible for party leadership precisely those who determine when perestroyka will achieve concrete results."

The workers are proposing the introduction of a quota in the composition of the highest party bodies for workers and collective farmers, corresponding to the percentage that they comprise within the CPSU. This introduction of the principle of the representative nature of democracy will make it possible, in their opinion, to avoid rule within the party "on behalf of the workers" and to progress to the real participation of the workers themselves in running party affairs.

The authors of the letter take the view that today it would be right to invite just the representatives of the workers and peasants to take part in the work of the 28th CPSU Congress. "The fate of the party, the fate of perestroyka and, ultimately, the fate of the country depend," they think, "on whether these proposals are supported or not," the letter says.

Situation in Osh Returning to Normal

LD1906221290 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2130 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Text] The situation in Osh Oblast, Kirghizia, is gradually returning to normal. In the town of Osh, virtually all trade enterprises and more than half of the works and factories are operating and passenger transport traffic is stabilizing.

At the same time, a tense situation persists in Uspenskiy Rayon, which suffered most as a result of the interethnic conflict. The process of reconciliation is taking its course here slowly and with difficulty.

Altogether, since the start of the tragic events, over 500 applications have reached the internal affairs bodies with the request to find citizens who were reported missing during the period 4-9 June. A special subunit of the republic's Internal Affairs Ministry is engaged in this.

'Great' Damage of Kazakhstan Quake Detailed

LD1906191390 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1328 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Summary] Alma-Ata, 19 Jun—TASS correspondent Vladimir Akimov reports that significant efforts are being directed to eliminate the consequences of the recent eight-point earthquake in the east of the republic in which one person died and which caused great material damage. In 122 settlements, about 8,000 houses were damaged, of which over half are unrestorable. Over 25,000 people lived in them. Seventy-two health establishments, 22 kindergartens, 36 clubs, 86 shops and a number of industrial buildings were damaged. The President of the Republic Nursultan Nazarbayev paid a visit to the stricken region. Food, medicine, consumer goods, heatable yurts, portable cabins, panel houses, and building materials are to be sent here.

Campaign Against Illegal Poppy Growing Viewed

PM0706170290 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 5 Jun 90 Morning Edition p 6

[Interview with N. Shuvalov, senior superintendent for important cases at the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs Administration for Combating Drug Addiction, by correspondent F. Ivanov under the rubric "From Competent Sources": "Clandestine Poppy Plantations Discovered"—date, place of interview not stated; first two paragraphs are IZVESTIYA introduction]

[Text] Operation "Poppy-90," conducted by the internal affairs organs in the republics of Central Asia and Kazakhstan, is in its fourth week.

IZVESTIYA's correspondent was told about the initial results by N. Shuvalov, senior superintendent for important cases at the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] Administration for Combating Drug Addiction.

[Shuvalov] The problem of combating drug addiction is first and foremost a problem of discovering the sources of the poison. It is known that in the USSR 80 percent of the drugs in circulation are of plant origin. The vast majority of drug addicts started with this kind of drug.

As early as 1934 sowings of the opium poppy by private individuals were banned in the USSR, and in 1974 a complete ban was imposed on sowing this crop, even for medical purposes. In 1987 private individuals were also forbidden to grow the oilseed poppy, which also contains a large quantity of narcotic substances. This decision was also extended to hemp sowings.

Severe sanctions were imposed for the violation of these laws: Growing opium poppies and hemp with a high drug content is punishable by up to five years' imprisonment, or up to eight years for a second offense. Sowings of oilseed poppies and other types of hemp incur administrative measures—a fine of up to 100 rubles, and for those caught sowing these crops a second time, criminal accountability is stipulated, in the form of up to three years' imprisonment.

Nonetheless the scale of illegal sowings is not declining. Last year some 100,000 such "plantations" were discovered, covering an area of 285 hectares; they were all destroyed. Particularly large numbers were found in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan, the Western Ukraine, and southern oblasts of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic].

The main reason that people commit this crime is the very large income from growing drug-bearing plants. For instance, the sowings that we destroyed last year could have brought their owners profits of more than R2 billion. Very frequently these "plantations" are grown on state, kolkhoz, or sovkhoz land, using land intended for growing other crops. All this happens with the connivance of leaders of enterprises and soviet organs, who sometimes themselves have an interest in the unlawful sowings.

In view of this complex situation, since 1986 the USSR MVD has conducted annual operations to find and destroy clandestine plantations. The latest such operation, "Poppy-90," began early in May in the Central Asian republics and Kazakhstan. The USSR MVD has now received the initial data, which enable us to say that the quantity of illegal sowings of drug-bearing plants has increased. Whereas last year 638 sowings of opium poppies, with an area of about 10 hectares, had been found in that region by 1 June, as of today about 1,200 such plantations have already been discovered, with an area of approximately 30 hectares. The "yield" could have given their owners some R225 million in profit.

Large sowings have been discovered in Koshrabadskiy Rayon in Uzbekistan's Samarkand Oblast. Thus at the "Ergash Dzhuman Bulbul" Sovkhoz opium was sown on a territory of six hectares, and at the "Rossiyskiy" Sovkhoz—on a territory of 1.3 hectares. In Urgutskiy Rayon these plantations occupied more than 10 hectares.

In Pendzhikentskiy Rayon in Tajikistan's Leninabad Oblast some 200 sowings have been discovered with an area of 10 hectares, one-fifth of them on farmstead plots. Some 200 sowings have been found in Chimkent Oblast in the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic].

We already know of cases where illegal sowings have been made by leaders at various levels. Thus in Uzbekistan a sowing of opium poppies on an area of 20 square meters was discovered on the territory of a water intake station in Sherabadskiy Rayon. It turned out to belong to station chief Rakhimov. In Surkhan-Darya Oblast a plantation of these poppies on an area of 800 square meters was discovered on the farmstead plot of Khaitov, deputy director of an asphalt plant. In Kazakhstan similar sowings were discovered in Chimkent Oblast on the land of Kulbayev, chief of the local communications junction, and Boyzhanova, a secondary school teacher. Proceedings are being taken against all of them.

The work of discovering illegal sowings has only just begun. It involves some 10,000 militia staffers and 17,000 representatives of the public, and 12 army and civil helicopters have been brought in. Soon the operation will be extended to other regions of the country too.

New Turkmen Video Regulation Law Published

PM1906153390 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 16 Jun 90 p 1

[Report by KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA correspondent A. Bushev: "Central Television Outlawed?"]

[Text] The other day local newspapers published the new Turkmen SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] law "On Regulating the Work of Video Halls, Video Salons, Video Bars, and Videotheques," which prohibits the showing or hire of videos other than in establishments which form part of the state movie network. Only the showing of video movies available at state-run videotheques is allowed.

There is another noteworthy point in this document.

It reads literally as follows:

"The Turkmen SSR Council of Ministers is instructed to draft a procedure for stopping the retransmission of Central Television programs in the Turkmen SSR that contain elements of immorality, eroticism, or spiritual aridity and which are not compatible with the traditions and mores of the republic's population; and for using this viewing time for Turkmen television broadcasts."

I do not know how the republic's Council of Ministers will act in this situation. Will it seat some commission at the retransmitter control panel and give it the right to cut off a "wrong" Central Television program (I assume "Vzglyad" will be the first to go) at the right (or, most probably, the wrong) moment?

It is not clear how the new law, produced in the heart of the apparatus and unanimously voted through by the Turkmen SSR Supreme Soviet, will mesh with the inalienable right of all Soviet citizens to free access to information and with the Law on the Press. No way, apparently.

Uzbek Supreme Soviet Begins Work 18 Jun

LD1906165790 Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian 0115 GMT 18 Jun 90

[Summary] Today in Tashkent the second session of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet of the 12th convocation began its work. This session will be examining the draft laws of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic on property and land; it intends to examine the question of the composition of the committee for social supervision of the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic, the measures taken by the Council of Ministers for transition to regulated market economy, and other questions.

Uzbek Medical Officer on Toxic Chemicals, AIDS

LD2805174190

[Editorial Report] Tashkent Domestic Service in Russian at 1300 GMT on 21 May carries a 14-minute recorded report on a news conference given by Iskandrov, chief medical officer of Uzbekistan, during which he delivered a report on the "prohibition and restriction of the use in Uzbekistan of highly toxic and dangerous chemicals in agriculture." The time and place of the news conference is not given.

The quantity of such substances, both foreign and home produced, used on one hectare of land in Uzbekistan is seven times more than the average used in the Soviet Union. As a result, an emergency sanitary and ecological situation has arisen, marked by diseases and chronic poisoning of people. The chief medical officer has issued

a resolution which says: "The use of 16 forms of highly toxic and highly dangerous chemicals in agriculture is prohibited today on the territory of Uzbekistan, and stage by stage in the course of the forthcoming half-year another eight types of these substances will be banned."

The press conference also heard a report on "the situation in and measures for the fight against AIDS in the republic. The reporter presents a recording of Iskandarov saying: "On 1 May 1990 in the Uzbek Soviet Socialist Republic 15 carriers of the AIDS virus had been discovered—11 foreigners and four Soviet citizens." He went on to say that forecasts for the spread of AIDS in the republic do not give rise to optimism. He continued: "Currently in Uzbekistan a unified service has been set up, consisting of 13 centers for the prevention of and fight against AIDS, operating at republican, city, and oblast levels." It is planned to open over 40 such centers. Iskandarov went on to say: "We are investigating more than 1.2 million donors, more than 1 million pregnant women, over 15,000 foreign citizens, and 23,000 drug addicts." He gave further details on such centers and pointed to the need for "prompt action in a series of oblasts such as Fergana, Surkhandarya, Kashkadarya, and Karakalpakis. Oblast AIDS centers do not even have the appropriate out-patient clinics and telephones. The emergence of AIDS gives rise to a lot of problems, and they must be tackled urgently."

Termez Station To Begin Television Programming

LD1906164690 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 19 Jun 90

[Summary] A new radio [as heard] building has come into use in Termez in Uzbekistan. It has studios, sound, and video libraries and editorial offices. It prepares local television broadcasts. It is intended to broadcast television programs in Uzbek, Tajik, and Russian.

Voluntary Work Raises Funds for Issyk-kul Lake

PM0706112990 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 5 Jun 90

[From the "Vremya" newscast: Reportage by V. Fedorov, I. Karelin, identified by caption, on pollution threat to Lake Issyk-kul, pegged to World Environmental Protection Day]

[Text] [Correspondent] The unparalleled beauty of the blue Tyan-Shan mountains and the outstanding therapeutic qualities of local nature have made Lake Issyk-kul a health resort of countrywide renown and a place of pilgramage for tourists. At the same time, industrial enterprises and transport are operating actively on its shores, there are livestock farms, mineral fertilizers and poisonous chemicals are being used on the fields, and there are even depots of these chemicals no more than 500 paces from the shore. Pollution is the biggest threat to this vulnerable mountain lake which has no outlet. Experts have noted with concern a general deterioration in the ecological situation and dangerous concentrations of harmful substances in the lake and local streams. [video shows lake, vacation cottages, industrial installations, livestock]. The flora and fauna in the resort zones are in a critical state. A Committee for the Protection of Lake Issyk-kul has been set up in the republic, special funds are being organized, and money is being collected. As part of the preparations for a republic telethon, a series of "Subbotniks" [voluntary Saturday work] has been organized by the Issyk-kul Oblast Soviet of People's Deputies, notably in Issyk-kul city.

[L.N. Shcherbina, Issyk-kul city party committee secretary, identified by caption, facing camera] In order to prevent a second Aral, in order to save our blue gem of a lake, the inhabitants of our city and of the whole oblast have decided to take part in a "Subbotnik" and to pay all the money earned into the fund for the preservation of Lake Issyk-kul.

[L.S. Chekmareva, oblast trade union committee secretary and "Subbotnik" organizer, identified by caption, facing camera] During a single "Subbotnik," in which some 300,000 people took part, 280,000 rubles were earned.

[L.N. Shcherbina] It is necessary to move all enterprises which are causing pollution as far away as possible from the shore, and that includes livestock farms, industrial plants, and even the local shipping line.

Instead of these barges here [video shows rusty barges] there should be an embankment here where people could come to take the air, go boating, and enjoy all this beauty. Can you see how the lake sparkles?